THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP ROLES AND JOB SATISFACTION AMONG ELEMENTARY TEACHERS IN A SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICT

By

PATRICIA A. GRILL

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1998

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my committee chairman, Dr. James Doud. Without his support and help over these past two and one half years, this project would not have reached fruition. Additional thanks and appreciation are extended to my other committee members: Dr. David Miller, Dr. Elizabeth Bondy, Dr. Paul George, and Dr. Craig Wood.

I would also like to express my thanks to my friends and team teachers, Karen and Mary. They offered much encouragement and support while I worked to complete this study.

Finally, I wish to thank my wonderful husband and two sons. Their support and understanding kept me going when things were difficult.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

ABSTRACT v

CHAPTERS .....

1 INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose of the Study 5
Operational Definition of Variables 7
Significance of the Study 9
Delimitations 10
Summary 10

2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE 12

Educational Organizations 13
Teacher Leadership 22
Theories of Job Satisfaction 33
Job Satisfaction Studies 44
Summary 49

3 METHODOLOGY 52

Participants 53
Variables 54
Instrumentation 56
Data Collection 60
Data Analysis 61
Summary 63

4 ANALYSIS OF DATA 64

Survey Response 65
Population Profile 66
Research Questions 71
Report of Teacher Comments 92
Summary 97

5 DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 98

Discussion of Research Questions 98
Discussion of Limitations 107
Discussion of Implications 108
Suggestions for Further Research 110

APPENDICES

A TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE 113

B PRINCIPALS' WEIGHTED RATINGS 117

C FLORIDA SCHOOL INDICATORS REPORT 120

D ITBS READING SCORES 122

E INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER 124

F STATISTICAL ANALYSES 126

REFERENCES 130

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH 141

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEADERSHIP ROLES
AND JOB SATISFACTION AMONG ELEMENTARY TEACHERS
IN A SELECTED SCHOOL DISTRICT

By

Patricia A. Grill

December 1998

Chairman: Dr. James L. Doud
Major Department: Educational Leadership

The need to attract and retain well-qualified and motivated teachers in the classrooms of our nation's schools is a prerequisite to creating and maintaining quality educational programs. Such goals are of concern to parents, educators, business persons, and government officials. The idea of allowing teachers to be leaders within their profession is an idea proposed both to attract and retain teachers and reform and improve education.

The purposes of this study were to investigate the amount of teacher leadership engaged in by elementary teachers, the amount of job satisfaction derived from their work as elementary teachers, and the nature of the relationship between participation in teacher leadership roles and job satisfaction. Furthermore, this study was done to investigate if there were significant differences in the means for participation in teacher leadership roles

and for job satisfaction when controlling for personal and school site demographics. This study also sought to ascertain if personal and school site demographics interacted with the relationship between job satisfaction and participation in teacher leadership roles.

This study involved a survey of 270 randomly selected elementary teachers from one midsized Florida school district comprised of 23 elementary schools serving a diverse population of students. A mailed questionnaire gathered data on participation in teacher leadership roles, teacher job satisfaction, and demographic factors. The sample mean for participation in teacher leadership roles was slightly more than three roles during the preceding year. On a 5-point Likert scale, the sample mean for general job satisfaction was 3.89 or slightly below satisfied.

An analysis of the data showed no significant correlation between participation in teacher leadership roles and measures of extrinsic, intrinsic, or general job satisfaction. Multiple regression analyses revealed a significant interaction of school socioeconomic status and student academic achievement with the relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in teacher leadership roles. Significant differences in the amount of teacher leadership were found for years of teaching experience and significant differences in general job satisfaction were found for gender, school size, student achievement, and school socioeconomic status.

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The modern movement for school reform began in 1983 with the publication of the report, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for School Reform*, released by the National Commission of Excellence in Education. Improvement in the public education system seemed to be an elusive goal. Eight years later, the call for change was issued again by President George Bush with the publication of *America 2000: An Education Strategy* (Alexander, 1991).

Transforming public schools from a 19th-century industrial-age model to a 21st-century information-age model requires engaging the people who will be responsible for carrying out this goal. Top-down, externally imposed, one-size-fits-all innovations often overlook the ideas and expertise of one critical group of participants--teachers. "If schools are to become the responsive, renewing institutions that they must, the teachers in them must be purposely engaged in the renewal process" (Goodlad, 1990, p. 25). Teachers' roles must empower them to be creative and active leaders in the daily functioning of their schools if reforms are to be realized (Fullan, 1993; Griffin, 1991; The Holmes Group, 1990; Lieberman & Miller, 1990).

Expanded and varied roles of leadership for teachers serve dual purposes. Leadership roles for teachers enhance the chance of successful school reform through the utilization of teacher expertise and provide incentive to attract and retain good teachers by

expanding and professionalizing the nature of the work (Smylie, 1995). Traditional roles of teacher leadership such as career ladder steps and lead or master teacher positions often result in expanded duties and supplemental pay. However, less traditional roles of teacher leadership are emerging which may redefine the job of teaching as a profession. Such roles do not come with titled positions nor do they create hierarchies within schools. They are embedded in everyday teaching tasks and roles and are inextricably tied to teacher learning (Darling-Hammond, Bullmaster, & Cobb, 1995).

Teacher leadership involves teacher participation in roles and activities which impact or influence educational practice beyond one's individual classroom or teaching assignment. Teachers may assume leadership roles as teacher mentors, teacher educators, curriculum developers, decision makers, problem solvers, change agents, and educational researchers. Teacher leadership is shared leadership based on the power to accomplish goals rather than exert power over people and events (Sergiovanni, 1987). Within a school, shared leadership is widely diffused among staff and may result from matching teachers' expertise, experience, and interests with the work that needs to be done.

Teacher leadership and empowerment are comingled in many respects. Teacher leadership roles are actual manifestations of teacher empowerment (Short & Rinehart, 1992). Lightfoot (1986) defined empowerment as the opportunities teachers have for power, choice, autonomy, and responsibility. Maeroff (1988) concluded that teacher empowerment consists of allowing teachers greater professional status and increasing their expertise and knowledge base. Dunst (1991) concluded that empowerment consists of enabling experiences which allow individuals to use existing competencies as well as

learn new competencies that improve the quality of their work. Zimmerman and Rappaport (1988) found empowerment to be negatively related to alienation and positively related to willingness to be a leader.

The organizational structure and the culture of a school can act as barriers to teacher leadership. Some administrators strive to preserve their power over teachers by refusing to provide time, resources, autonomy, and opportunities for teacher collaboration (Donahoe, 1993; Lieberman, 1992). Some teachers are content with the status quo and are unwilling to venture beyond their classroom to assist other teachers or to learn from others in order to improve their own teaching skills (Frase & Sorenson, 1992).

How does participation in teacher leadership roles affect the satisfaction teachers feel about their work? Over the past several decades, researchers have sought to understand job satisfaction in relation to job commitment, workforce stability, and increased productivity (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992). Researchers have suggested teacher leadership opportunities are ways to attract and retain teachers in the profession (Smylie, 1995; Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). Furthermore, studies indicate that if teachers are dissatisfied with their work and lack commitment to their organizations, not only will teachers suffer but students will also be negatively impacted (Csikzentmihalyi & McCormack, 1986; Rosenholtz, 1989).

Current theories concerning job satisfaction fall into one of three conceptual frameworks--content theories, process or discrepancy theories, and situational theories. Content theories attempt to explain job satisfaction in terms of needs that must be satisfied or values that must be attained (Locke, 1976). Maslow's (1970) Need Hierarchy

Theory and Herzberg's (1966) Two-Factor Theory are examples of content theories. Process or discrepancy theories seek to explain job satisfaction as the difference between an individual's desired work outcomes (expectancies) and what an individual actually receives from the organization. Porter and Lawler's (1968) Need Satisfaction Theory and Vroom's (1964) Expectancy Model are two examples of discrepancy theories of job satisfaction. Situational theories of job satisfaction attempt to explain how a variety of factors such as task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and individual characteristics combine to produce job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The Situational Occurrences Theory (Quarstein, McAfee, & Glassman, 1992), the Predictors of Job Satisfaction (Glisson & Durick, 1988), and the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1980) are examples of situational theories.

Sergiovanni (1990) in his research on teachers and teaching suggested that "the secret to motivating extraordinary commitment and performance over time can only be found in the work itself" (p. 128). School boards and school administrators must provide teachers the types of roles and work environments that will satisfy their needs and expectations or risk a population of teachers who mentally capitulate or physically drop out of the teaching profession. School boards and school administrators must find ways to motivate and satisfy their teaching staffs in ways that are embodied in the normal everyday work of teachers.

There is evidence to suggest that teachers who have leadership roles are more engaged and satisfied with their jobs as teachers (Conley & Levinson, 1993; Ellis, 1988; Kim & Loadman, 1994; Klecker & Loadman, 1996). Many of the leadership roles

described in recent literature are innovative and provide opportunities for professional and personal challenge and growth. Collaborative interaction with colleagues and professional autonomy in decision making affecting educational practices are frequently cited as an intricate part of teacher leadership (Fullan & Stiegelbauer, 1991). Such a description of teacher leadership appears to satisfy Maslow's (1970) higher order needs of esteem and self-actualization and Herzberg's (1966) motivating factors of recognition, responsibility, growth, the work itself, advancement, and achievement. Opportunities for teacher leadership seem to support the expectancies of a professional workforce bound by autonomy, accountability, and self-regulation. Finally, the redesign of the work itself and the work environment (workplace) utilizing a facilitative democratic rather than a traditional authoritarian orientation would appear to produce the critical psychological states in teachers that Hackman and Oldham (1980) suggested would lead to an outcome of high internal work motivation and job satisfaction.

The effects of moderator variables involving personal and school demographics on participation in roles of leadership and job satisfaction are less clear. The researcher was unable to find any recent studies that looked at these particular variables specifically for elementary teachers in public school classrooms.

Purpose of the Study

The first purpose of this study was to investigate the amount of teachers' participation in leadership roles and whether differences in the amount of participation exist among teachers when compared by personal and school demographics. A second

purpose was to determine how satisfied elementary teachers were with their work and whether differences in measures of job satisfaction exist among teachers when compared by personal and school demographics. A third purpose was to investigate the relationships among the variables of the study--participation in leadership roles, job satisfaction, and personal and school demographics. The final purpose was to determine whether differences exist in the means of job satisfaction measures when compared by level of participation in teacher leadership roles. This study involved only elementary classroom teachers employed in public schools.

This research addressed the following questions:

1. How actively do elementary teachers participate in teacher leadership roles?

2. How satisfied are elementary teachers with their work in terms of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction?

3. Are there significant differences in the means of participation in teacher leadership roles when analyzed by personal demographics (gender, age, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, and academic degree) and school demographics (size, academic achievement, and socioeconomic status)?

4. Are there significant differences in the means of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction when analyzed by personal and school demographics?

5. Are there significant relationships among job satisfaction, participation in teacher leadership roles, and personal and school demographics? Does the relationship between job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles interact with the demographic variables?

6. Is there a significant difference in the means of job satisfaction measures for elementary teachers when compared by levels of participation in leadership roles?

Operational Definition of Variables

Operational definitions are as follows:

Job satisfaction is defined as an affective response resulting from an overall appraisal of one's work and career situation (Locke, 1976). Job satisfaction refers to a worker's appraisal of the extent to which work fulfills his or her needs or preferences, meets the expectancies of outcomes held by a worker, or creates certain critical psychological states for the worker.

Intrinsic job satisfaction is the satisfaction resulting from doing the work itself. It includes such factors as variety, ability utilization, responsibility, creativity, independence, social service, achievement, authority, security, morality, activity level, and social status. It stems from an internal source or from within the individual. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire yields an intrinsic satisfaction score.

Extrinsic job satisfaction is the satisfaction stemming from an external source and is apart from the satisfaction that is derived from the work itself. It involves factors such as compensation, advancement opportunities, recognition, company policies and procedures, and supervision on both personal and task dimensions. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire yields an extrinsic satisfaction score.

General job satisfaction combines both extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction with additional components including coworkers and working conditions. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire yields a general satisfaction score.

Teacher leadership is a collective or collaborative form of leadership which is inclusive rather than exclusive and often flows from a match between teachers' expertise and interests and the work that needs to be done. Teacher leadership is a function of the work itself rather than a title or position within the school organization. Suleiman and Moore (1996) proposed a definition of teacher leadership as "a transforming relationship between teachers, administrators, community, and concerned others who intend real educational reform grounded in shared consensus coupled with successful classroom application and research" (p. 6).

In the context of this study, teacher leadership roles include the broad areas of teacher mentors, teacher educators, curriculum developers, decision makers, problem solvers, change agents, and researchers engaged in knowledge building. Teacher leadership is measured by a researcher-constructed, weighted checklist of teacher behaviors.

Personal demographics include gender, age, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, and academic degree attained by teacher. Gender is coded male or female. Age encompasses groups 20-29 years, 30-39 years, 40-49 years, 50-59 years, and 60 years and over. Ethnicity is categorized as white/Caucasian, black/Afro-American, Hispanic, and other. Years of teaching experience encompass groups with 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21-25 years, and 26 years and over. Academic degrees include

bachelor's, master's, specialist, and doctoral. Personal demographic information was reported by participants on the questionnaire.

School demographics include school population size, student academic achievement, and school socioeconomic status. School population size and socioeconomic status reported as the percentage of students on free and reduced-price lunch was provided by the Florida Department of Education in the *Florida School Indicators Report* for the year in which the study was done. Student academic achievement was based on the reading scores on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Grade 2) as reported for each school by the school district for the year in which the study was done.

Significance of the Study

The need to attract and retain well-qualified and enthusiastic (motivated) teachers in the classrooms of our nation's schools is a prerequisite to creating and maintaining quality educational programs. Such goals are of concern to parents, educators, business persons, and government officials. The idea of allowing teachers to be leaders within their profession is an idea that is proposed to both attract and retain teachers and reform and improve education.

The purposes of this study were to investigate teacher participation in leadership roles, teacher job satisfaction, and whether there is a relationship between participation in leadership roles and job satisfaction. Hargreaves (1994) and Lieberman (1992) in their research emphasized teachers' work and roles have changed and will and should continue to change in the postmodern age to include more leadership roles. This investigation

broadened and updated previous research by determining whether participation in teacher leadership roles was related to job satisfaction for elementary teachers in today's schools.

Job satisfaction has been identified as an important factor in both the stability of the teaching workforce (Cranny et al., 1992) and teachers' organizational commitment (Wu & Short, 1996). This study seeks to provide information and evidence to school boards and school administrators regarding the value of providing leadership opportunities and responsibilities that may enhance the satisfaction and motivation of elementary teachers.

Delimitations

A sample of convenience in which all participants were teachers from one midsized school district in the state of Florida was used in this study. This type of sampling may result in an atypical subject population and may pose a threat to the generalizability of the results.

A survey using a questionnaire involves a self-report measure and thus may have a self-report bias. Respondents may not be completely candid with their answers. Questionnaires cannot probe deeply into a respondent's feelings or opinions, nor can items be clarified if respondents are in doubt of their meanings.

Summary

The changing roles of the elementary teacher and the changing demographics of the teaching workforce make a study involving attitudes and feelings toward the job of

teaching timely. Job satisfaction impacts both the stability and commitment of workers and, thus, the quality of services delivered to students and community.

The next chapter reviews recent literature on teacher leadership viewed by many as a critical component of public education reform. Chapter 2 also examines the major theoretical frameworks of job satisfaction and reports on findings of relevant studies involving this concept. The chapter begins with a brief overview of the context of educational organizations.

CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study had several purposes. The first purpose was to investigate the amount of teachers' participation in leadership roles and whether differences in the amount of participation exist among teachers when compared by personal and school demographics. A second purpose was to determine how satisfied elementary teachers were with their work and whether differences in measures of job satisfaction exist among teachers when compared by personal and school demographics. A third purpose was to investigate the relationships between the variables of the study--participation in leadership roles, job satisfaction, and personal and school demographics. The final purpose was to determine whether differences exist in the means of job satisfaction measures when compared by level of participation in teacher leadership roles. This study involved only elementary classroom teachers employed in public schools.

In order to help the reader understand the context of teacher leadership and job satisfaction, the review of literature begins with a brief examination of educational organizations. A review of the research on teacher leadership roles and job satisfaction follows.

Educational Organizations

This section is not meant to be a comprehensive review of literature on organizational theory or leadership theory. The purpose is to examine key ideas relating to such theories that are relevant to the existence of teachers as leaders within an elementary school setting. Leadership has been described as being both contextual and relational (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Therefore, to understand teacher leadership better, it is important to have some understanding of the educational organization in which it exists. The following sections briefly examine organizational structure, organizational culture, leadership styles of principals, and the impact of the educational reform movements on the educational organization.

Organizational Structure

In order to understand better the roles and functioning of teacher leaders, it is necessary to understand the context or organizational structure in which these roles emerge and exist. Educational organizations are structured as dual systems, bureaucratic or tightly coupled in some ways and loosely coupled in other ways (Donahoe, 1993; Glickman, 1985; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Owens, 1991; Weick, 1982). Schools are different not only in their structure from other organizations, but also they are unique in their specific circumstances (Weick, 1982). Furthermore, organizational structure impacts most of the activities within an organization--the reporting relationships between supervisor and subordinate, communication patterns, decision-making procedures, norms

of employee conduct, the accountability system, and the reward and recognition system of the organization (Jones, 1981).

Donahoe (1993) observed the following:

> The traditional school organization minimizes collective, collegial behavior on the part of teachers. It maximizes two conflicting behaviors. It leads to bureaucratic, rule-prone direction from the top, since the school is not set up to determine its own direction and rules, but then it creates autonomous teachers who, behind their classroom doors, can readily ignore much of the top-down direction. (p. 299)

Much earlier, Goodlad (1984) expressed similar findings when he reported that there is no "infrastructure designed to encourage or support either communication among teachers in improving their teaching or collaboration in attacking schoolwide problems. And so teachers, . . . to a large extent carry on side by side similar but essentially separated activities" (p. 188).

Thus, instruction is loosely coupled to the extent that it is usually done behind the doors of the classroom and not observed directly or controlled by school administrators. Teachers often are isolated and autonomous in their own classrooms. However, administrators have bureaucratic means to structure and influence indirectly the instructional behavior of teachers. They can control schedules, assign students to classes, group students or teachers, and control resources to exert influence on the instructional behaviors of teachers. There are also numerous noninstructional activities that are closely controlled by administrators (Meyer & Rowan, 1983). Some researchers have noted that aspects of bureaucracy are incompatible with professionalism (Campbell, Cunningham, Nystrand, & Usdan, 1990).

Donahoe (1993) suggested school-site councils, school-based management, or shared decision making could provide the infrastructure that would enable teachers and community to work together on schoolwide concerns. However, he suggested in his research that these forms of school management must be woven into the school fabric and not just appliquéd onto the traditional school organization. He concluded that successful schools need to outgrow their dependency on a principal. Every member of the school staff must have an active role in the formal organization which functions as a direct rather than representative democracy. Thus, the role of isolated teachers on the fringes of a bureaucracy would no longer exist within the organization.

Organizational Culture

Definitions of organizational culture as found in the literature have much in common. Reichers and Schneider (1990) referred to organizational culture as meanings, beliefs, and understandings shared by a particular group concerning its problems, practices, and goals. Schein (1992) defined the culture of a group as

> a pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, [ought] to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 12)

Morgan (1986) observed that cultures evolve from social practices that are internalized and expressed in a group's formal rules, policies, and procedures. Morgan defined culture as an ongoing socially created reality that has underlying values, beliefs, and assumptions about the environment, reality and truth, human nature, human activity, and human

relationships. Thus, the culture of an educational organization shapes the perceptions and understandings of what it means to be a teacher.

Recent studies suggest organizational culture is a powerful mechanism for creating effective organizations and for understanding the roles people play within an organization (Bolman & Deal, 1991; Conway, 1990; Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Donahoe, 1993; Marshall, 1993; Peterson, 1988; Snyder, 1988). Thus, the culture of a school may help determine the roles teachers play within that educational organization. The culture of a school may not only allow and accept but also expect and encourage teachers to assume leadership roles. Culture may also exclude teachers from such roles.

Culture is a force that provides stability and a sense of continuity as well as a force that allows an organization to adapt and to deal with change. Real change in an organization involves a cultural transformation of its members in which their perceiving, thinking, feeling, and behavior changes (Deal & Kennedy, 1982). An organization benefits if its culture believes that being learning-oriented, adaptive, and innovative is the correct way to perceive, think, feel, and behave (Schein, 1992; Senge, 1990). Therefore, culture affects not only what is done but also how it gets done and how people feel about what they are doing.

Assuming reform or restructuring in an educational organization renders it more effective in promoting student and teacher learning, Donahoe (1993) observed that traditional structures still persist in many cases because new ideas have not been woven into the organizational fabric or culture. Purkey and Smith (1985) suggested several strategies to build an organization's cultural acceptance of reform in schools. They

include assigning to staff members clear responsibilities and high expectations, encouraging collaborative planning and participative decision making, and fostering collegiality through shared staff development and peer teaching and learning. Little (1988) claimed that school culture is conducive to leadership by teachers when teachers observe each other, learn from each other's practices, and hold in-depth discussions about those practices. Donahoe proposed the kind of culture and supporting structure that schools need reduces both top-down bureaucratic direction and classroom autonomy and isolation. The need is to facilitate the upward and lateral movement of influence through the organization.

School Leadership

Leadership can be defined as a relationship between leader and follower--a process of mutual influence that fuses thought, feeling, and action to produce collective effort to serve the purpose and values of both the leader and led (Bolman & Deal, 1991). Traditional bureaucratic ideas about leadership have been subject to criticism because they usually focus on only one person in an authority position as the sole or prime source of leadership and assume a static role for others to follow (Smyth, 1989). Such leadership ideas fail to recognize that "leadership is not a zero-sum game in which one person gets some only when another loses some" (Barth, 1988b, p. 133). A principal demonstrates leadership when teachers are enlisted and empowered as school leaders. However, Barth suggested some principals perceive the advocacy of increased teacher participation in school governance as an attempt to steal their power and, thus, resist efforts to include teachers in decision making.

Foster (1986) traced the origins of the bureaucratic-managerial model of leadership to the influence of Frederick Winslow Taylor. In this model, leadership is a function of organizational position and is concerned with the efficient management of the organization. According to Foster, the trait theory, the situational approach, and the contingency approach to leadership are all variations of the bureaucratic-managerial model where success is equated with how effectively followers are manipulated.

Burns' (1978) ideas on political leadership are often cited by educational administrators. Burns described two types of leadership: transactional and transformational. Transactional leadership is based on an exchange relationship between leader and followers for purposes of achieving individual objectives. Bennis and Nanus (1985) noted that much of the work in organizations is accomplished through transactional leadership where tasks are completed for rewards or favors. Their research questioned the level of commitment gained by such leadership. In contrast, transformational leadership assumes a leader is able to inspire and transform followers--to persuade others to believe in his vision, thus making it a common vision. However, not every school leader is capable of fulfilling this "hero" role.

Proponents of democratized schools suggest we move beyond the bureaucratic-managerial and even the transformational model of leadership (Sergiovanni, 1992). Leadership can come from many sources, and the more leadership opportunities and participants, the greater the chance that a school will achieve true reform. Foster (1986) proposed that we look at leadership in schools in terms of leadership acts. He defined leadership as "an act, bounded in space and time; it is an act that enables others and

allows them, in turn, to become enablers" (p. 187). Such leadership acts promote democratic participation in the life of a school.

Opportunities for teachers to be leaders within their schools often depend on the leadership style of the principal (Blase & Blase, 1996; Fay, 1992; Lieberman, 1992). Leadership style has been defined as an action disposition, or set or pattern of behavior, displayed by a leader in a leadership situation (Immegart, 1988). Leadership style is often conceptualized as task oriented versus people oriented, authoritarian versus democratic.

Halpin (1966) in his research on the effectiveness of task-oriented (extent a leader provides structure for tasks needing to be done) versus people-oriented leadership (degree of consideration a leader has for individual needs) found that leaders whose behavior is high in both task and people orientation were generally viewed as effective leaders. Leaders high in people orientation tended to have more satisfied subordinates (Fleishman & Harris, 1982), but those leaders who are task oriented achieved greater group productivity--at least initially (Schriesheim, House, & Kerr, 1976).

Authoritarian versus democratic leadership refers to the extent followers are permitted to participate in decision making. Authoritarian leaders allow little or no employee participation in organizational decision making. Democratic leaders encourage individual and group input. Reviews of research on productivity levels of autocratically versus democratically led groups have been inconclusive. However, research reviews have consistently indicated satisfaction and morale are higher in democratically led groups (Bass, 1990; Jago, 1982). Duke, Showers, and Imber (1990) found subordinate

participation in decision making is of greater value to the organization when employees exhibit a willingness to participate, see benefits accruing from their participation, and receive satisfaction from participating.

The School Reform Movement

There have been many calls for the reform of education from many sources and from many levels in our country over the past decade and a half. Owens (1991) and Kowalski and Reitzug (1993) identified two waves of public school reform.

The first school reform movement, which began with the publication of *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform* in 1983, was marked by regulatory mandates imposed by states upon their schools. These mandates shifted from issues of equity in our schools to an emphasis on issues of quality and excellence seen as a necessity for national security and economic prosperity (Finn, 1991). However, top-down mandates failed to produce the desired results in student achievement. The reform efforts made teachers low-level functionaries in a public hierarchical bureaucracy. State legislatures legislated mandates, and the burden of implementation was left to local schools. Teachers and principals were more accountable and yet less empowered. The first wave of reform neglected the development of productive human relationship in schools and the need for greater professional autonomy for teachers in diagnosing and solving problems (Boyer, 1985; Owens, 1991). Reformers began to doubt whether improvements could be made within the current structure of public education.

Second wave reform efforts which began in the late 1980s addressed concerns of centralization and state mandates by emphasizing the restructuring of schools. Reform

ideas such as collaborative professional development schools (Darling-Hammond, Bullmaster, & Cobb, 1995) and teacher participation in schoolwide decision and policy making and implementation (Holmes Group, 1990) emerged. This wave of reform acknowledged that change initiatives were needed at the individual school closest to where problems emerged and could be solved. Reformers called for the professionalization of teaching and the restructuring of roles and relationships among people who worked in schools. The authors of *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986) advocated extending teachers a role in school governance through participative decision making and lent support to the broader idea of utilizing teachers as leaders. They suggested that teachers become actively involved in studying problems, making decisions to solve them, and implementing solutions. A realignment of authority, deregulation, and school-driven reform agendas created new roles for teachers and administrators. In short, reform in the late 1980s called for a collaborative workplace with teachers who were "more fully engaged than in the past, more highly motivated because of their increased 'ownership' of the action" (Owens, 1991, p. 35).

The second wave of reform sought improvements in the preparation of teachers and administrators (Goodlad, 1990). If schools are to be restructured with less bureaucracy and state level policy, teachers must be prepared to assume more responsibilities in areas of evaluation, decision making, and organizational planning. Administrators also must have new and strengthened skills in instructional leadership and facilitation (Kowalski & Reitzug, 1993).

The following section explores teacher leadership. The nature, problems, and possibilities of teacher leadership within the elementary school setting as well as the contributions of teacher leadership to school reform are examined.

Teacher Leadership

As the effort to restructure schools continues, the importance of teacher participation in leadership in the total process of reform and change is readily apparent (Blase & Blase, 1996; Lieberman, 1992; Livingston, 1992; Smylie, 1995). The intense interest in restructuring and improving our country's education system is often dependent on teachers. At the same time, teacher leadership outside of the classroom is in itself a restructured role for teachers.

Although much has been written about teacher leadership since 1990, Smylie (1995) found few studies use theory to focus research questions and fewer seek to develop new theoretical insights. Most studies deal with the policy logic that establishes the particular teacher leadership opportunities and are primarily descriptive in nature. Much of the literature portrays a narrow view of teacher leadership as a position to which teachers are appointed and neglects the less positional, less structured, emergent forms of teacher leadership.

The Context of Teacher Leadership

According to Yukl (1994), teacher leadership is an organizational phenomenon in that it occurs in, is influenced by, and exerts influence on the structural, social, political, and cultural dimensions of the school organization. Wasley (1992) suggested that teacher

leadership involves "influencing and engaging colleagues toward improved practice" (p. 22). Teacher leadership cannot easily be understood apart from the school context in which it exists.

Recent research suggests that the success or failure of teacher leadership innovations depends in part on the leadership provided by administrators (Little, 1988). Most teacher leadership has existed at the prerogative of administrators within a hierarchical structure of decision making and involves minimal levels of collegial or collaborative involvement and little or no training (Barth, 1988a; Livingston, 1992).

For most of the 20th century, educational leadership structures have been top-down with somewhat of a heroic vision of the school principal as leader (Hart, 1995). She claims that schools today are professional workplaces that demand more expansive, flexible, and varied leadership roles. Organizations such as schools involve interactive influence processes, beliefs, efforts, knowledge, and communication and, thus, need multidirectional and interactive forms of leadership.

Powell and DiMaggio (1991) observed that school organizations have powerful conserving forces that are resistant to change. Smylie (1995) viewed teacher leadership as both an instance of change and a vehicle for change in the deep structures of symbols, routines, norms, and conventions of a school. He believed teacher leadership could create tensions, and attempts to maintain the institutional order might contravene the efforts of teacher leadership.

Teacher leadership challenges some long-established and accepted values, beliefs, and norms of the teaching profession as well as the professional self-concepts and

philosophies of some school principals (Hart & Bredeson, 1996). Little (1995) noted the possibility that formal teacher leadership roles result in a loss of collegiality among teachers. Teachers who take on leadership roles are often held suspect by colleagues. Their motives are questioned, and their actions are seen as a stepping stone away from classroom teaching to an administrative position (Walters & Guthro, 1992).

Some structures for teacher leadership in schools are formal, while other roles remain informal. Teachers often exercise leadership without formal authority. An informal yet empowered professional work environment may result when a group's history and culture blend with a principal's skills, beliefs, and commitment. However, such an arrangement may collapse if there is a change in principal, teacher mix, or community conflict (Barth, 1988b; Hart, 1995). Barth described emergent leadership resulting from a match between an important school issue and a teacher who feels passionately about it. Emergent leadership allows all teachers the opportunity for ownership of a responsibility about which they deeply care. It results in a community of leaders where everyone wins--no one teacher is overburdened, and all that choose can be involved in issues that are important to them.

Lieberman (1992) suggested that necessary conditions for teacher leadership involve systemic challenges. These conditions involve "an overall vision and a set of values that accepts and expects teachers to participate in leadership" (p. 160), appropriate structures and contexts, and sufficient time. Such conditions are needed to build collaborative cultures for learner-centered schools.

Teacher leadership is a hallmark of recent efforts to restructure schools and professionalize teaching. Smylie (1995) elaborated upon three related objectives of efforts to develop teacher leadership.

> First, they seek to enhance the quality of the teacher workforce by expanding and diversifying the nature of teacher's work, providing a wider array of incentives to attract and retain the most talented teachers in the profession. Second, they intend to establish new incentives, controls, and opportunities for professional learning and development aimed to improve the performance of practicing teachers. Third, these efforts seek to enhance the institutional capacity and performance of schools by placing teachers in positions of leadership and decision making, thereby increasing resources and expertise available for improvement. (pp. 3-4)

Hart (1995) also investigated the objectives of emergent views of teacher leadership. Her research defined the purposes for teacher leadership and authority as follows: (a) promoting a more democratic, communal, or communitarian workplace (Sergiovanni, 1994); (b) capitalizing on teacher expertise and experience as a school resource (Griffin, 1995; Heller & Firestone, 1995); (c) providing valued career growth opportunities making it possible to recruit, retain, and reward the best teachers (Smylie, 1995); (d) promoting instructional and curriculum reform by empowering teachers who will be responsible for implementing innovations; and (e) developing a more professional workplace. However, such ambitious objectives for teacher leadership can bring negative side effects such as role ambiguity, conflict, and work overload (Smylie, 1992; Smylie & Denny, 1990).

Little (1988) asserted that it would be implausible that our schools could attract and retain talented teachers, improve the performance of schools, and make reasonable

demands on administrators without promoting leadership in teaching by teachers. However, Little noted that traditional practice supports a view of teaching as an individual enterprise and that teachers are far less likely to defer to another teacher's view of teaching than to rely upon habit and personal preference. Initiatives by teacher leaders to influence the practices of an experienced colleague were given hesitant approval by teachers, and such initiatives are rarely done in practice other than for inexperienced teachers and for those who request help. Devaney (1987) concluded lead teachers gain legitimacy and credibility by continuing to teach part time and by continuing to improve their own teaching while providing leadership in curriculum and instruction.

In order to influence others, teacher leaders need some power base--some source of authority to influence others. The source of power must be perceived as authentic by both leader and led. French and Raven (as cited in Bass, 1990) described five power sources on which leaders may draw: reward power, coercive power (ability to punish), legitimate power (based on shared norms and values), referent power (association with others), and expertise. An emphasis on expertise in the form of continuous learning, reflection, inquiry, and research is a strong power base for teacher leaders (Wasley,1992).

Formal and Informal Roles

The restructuring movement aimed at the improvement of schooling and student learning and the professionalization of teaching presents opportunities for teachers to exercise leadership. The roles are varied and contextual. Some are appointed and formal in nature while others are emergent and informal. In the researcher's review of literature, teacher leadership falls into the following broad and somewhat overlapping categories: (a)

mentor or lead teacher, (b) teacher educator, (c) curriculum developer, (d) problem solver, (e) change agent, (f) participative decision maker, and (g) researcher or knowledge builder. Teacher leadership is more apt to flourish in schools where teachers perceive the school as a "center of inquiry" where questioning, reflecting, and learning is normal for teachers and students (Miller, 1992).

Career Ladders and Lattices

One formal method for providing career incentives and teacher leadership roles is a career ladder plan. Career ladder plans establish a promotion system involving a series of steps based on different levels of teacher competence and responsibility. With job role distinctions and salary differentials, career ladders provide one form of teacher empowerment and help to professionalize the teacher's role (Christensen, McDonnell, & Price, 1988). Hart (1995) found career ladder plans advanced professional expertise; a staged career; innovation in curriculum and instruction; and increased power, authority, and monetary rewards. When the career ladder plan included a mentoring role, influence over the future of the profession was a major intrinsic reward.

Criticism of career ladders stems from the fact that they are most often competition based, available to only a small proportion of teachers, and available to only those with lengthy tenure in the classroom (Little, 1988; Rosenholtz, 1985). Smylie and Denny (1990) found many teacher-leaders spent much of their time attending meetings and planning at the district or school level but had little impact on helping or supporting fellow teachers in working with students and improving practice.

The career lattice model is a way to personalize staff development and provide opportunities for teacher leadership. The roles and responsibilities are determined by the needs, interest, and talents of individual staff members and the needs and financial resources of the school. The variety of roles in the career lattice provides professional development options for the diverse needs of teachers at different stages of their careers and the complex organizational needs of their schools (Christensen et al., 1988).

Participative Decision Making

Hart (1995) and Johnson (1993) found that teacher leadership through school-based governance and decision making supports the spirit of communitarian and democratic ideals. In addition, school-based governance uses teacher expertise in the decision process and creates a more professional work environment.

Griffin (1995) examined how teacher participation in school-based decisions may affect school and classroom activity. Participative decision making invites teachers to become part of the deliberation and decision mechanisms whereby schoolwide policies and procedures are determined rather than designed and controlled by either a central office or school administrators. Griffin found strong school level consequences resulting from participative decision making. However, participative decision making had relatively modest effects on how teachers work with students in the classroom. Griffin's study attributed this finding to "teacher's beliefs about their own competence, the persistence of the culture of teacher isolation, prevailing forms of politesse in schools, professional educators' uncertainty about what makes up excellence in schools, and information and decision making overload" (p. 29). Cohen (1990) concluded that teachers

working in relative isolation of their classrooms have little opportunity to learn from one another but that participation in an organization's decision-making process gives opportunities to become vested in the organization's work and to utilize intellectual resources and experience of others to solve school problems.

Kowalski and Reitzug (1993) suggested that including teachers in decision making has several positive outcomes. They suggested shared decision making (a) creates a more stimulating and professional occupation, (b) increases teacher autonomy (group not individual) resulting in better attitudes and performance, (c) recognizes a right to control one's own destiny, and (d) expands expertise and is likely to result in improved decisions.

Agents of Change

School reform or restructuring is synonymous with change. The literature on planned change within schools emphasizes the need for strong leadership. A school principal is often identified as the key to change. Heller and Firestone (1995) found change functions within schools were performed not by individuals or by specific roles but by many people in many different roles. They defined leadership "as a set of tasks to be performed rather than the work of a role" and "found many people doing those tasks, sometimes in a jointly coordinated manner and sometimes with relatively little communication" (p. 66). Leadership for change is a redundant task whereby many people contribute to leading, including teachers. However, often teachers are viewed as impediments to change and resistant to new role relationships (Little, 1988; Smylie & Denny, 1990).

Firestone (1989) identified six leadership functions needed to sustain a change process. These included providing and selling a vision of the change; obtaining resources of time, personnel, funds, materials, and facilities; providing encouragement and recognition; adapting standard operating procedures; monitoring the improvement effort; and handling disturbances and interference from outside and from within. The results of this study concluded the contribution of formal administrator roles was less than past research suggested, whereas that of teachers was larger. The functions of leadership were often fulfilled redundantly by teachers and administrators. Teachers fulfilled leadership functions of sustaining vision, providing encouragement, monitoring change efforts, and handling disturbances. Without formal authority, teachers were unable to control resources or adapt standard operating procedures.

Professional Development Schools

Darling-Hammond et al. (1995) defined new emergent forms of teacher leadership within restructured professional development schools (PDSs). These researchers made three claims:

> that teacher leadership is inextricably connected to teacher learning; that teacher leadership can be embedded in tasks and roles that do not create artificial, imposed, formal hierarchies and positions--and that such approaches may lead to greater professionwide leadership as the "normal" role of teacher is expanded; and that the stimulation of such leadership and learning is likely to improve the capacity of schools to respond to the needs of students. (p. 89)

This conception of teacher leadership is quite different than the traditional, officially defined "add-ons" described by Smylie and Denny (1990) as the "individual appoint, anoint, and training" approach. Such an approach violates the strong egalitarian

ethic among classroom teachers and may overlook much leadership potential (Boles & Troen, 1994).

Teacher leadership roles emergent in PDSs can be utilized in all schools (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). Roles identified are mentors and teacher educators, curriculum developers and decision makers, problems solvers and change agents, and researchers engaged in knowledge building. Leadership roles involve a constructivist understanding of learning for both teachers and students whereby new knowledge and understanding come from formulating, testing, and enacting ideas. Leadership in PDSs is the "power to accomplish" rather than "power over people or events" (Sergiovanni, 1987). Leadership is widely shared and flows from matches that evolve between teacher's expertise and interests with the work that needs to be done.

Within PDSs, leadership roles are a normal part of a teacher's daily work (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995). Teachers assume leadership in roles of mentors and teacher educators. Through modeling, advising, coaching, holding seminars, and offering assistance, mentors and teacher educators pass on the collective improvements in practice and enforce professional standards. As curriculum developers and decision makers, teachers make decisions about content and methods that support the needs of diverse learners. Teachers are not merely conduits through which knowledge flows to learners but designers and innovators of curriculum and instruction. As participants in shared decision making, teachers are empowered to pose problems and, through inquiry and collaboration, implement changes and solve problems. As researchers, teachers are involved in systematic inquiry, experimentation, and reflection using case studies, action

research, or other structured investigations to probe problems of classroom or schoolwide practice. Leadership and learning are concepts that cannot be separated. The egalitarian teacher leadership roles studied in PDSs challenge the hierarchical and positional conceptions of leadership which identifies leaders as those holding formal occupational roles "above" teachers (McLaughlin & Yee, 1988).

Barriers to Teacher Leadership

Providing or making time during the school day represents the greatest deterrent to teacher interest in assuming new roles as leaders. Opportunities for training, study, reflection, and collegial exchange demanded by teacher leadership roles and responsibilities are time consuming and are often added to teachers' regular classroom workload. Time is a valuable resource for teacher leaders (Donahoe, 1993; Fay, 1992; Lieberman, 1992).

Culture--the inherited traditions of an egalitarian profession that refute status differences, the persistent belief that teaching is a matter of style rather than substance, and the pervasive privacy and isolation of classroom teaching--is also a barrier. Often, little preparation, training, or support is given to teacher leaders. In addition, teachers' potential encroachment on traditional domains of principals' authority has generated worried speculation in some administrators (Little, 1988). Many teachers and principals feel that teaching and leadership are mutually exclusive and that to be a leader one must leave teaching.

Leiberman (1986) and Kerchner and Caufman (1995) contended that union contracts often block reforms and opportunities for teacher leadership. Critics fear that any diffusion of authority will give more power to unions without empowering individual

teachers. Negotiations at the bargaining table often require the role occupied by teacher leaders to be so distinct from that of administrators that cooperation is suspect and difficult.

Newman (1990) suggested antifeminism may slow changes that give more leadership to teachers. The teaching profession is composed of a majority of females, while the majority of school administrators are male. To the extent that some men still view women as second class and subordinate in the workplace, the concept of a professional organization has political ramifications.

The next sections examine the concept of worker job satisfaction. Major theoretical frameworks of job satisfaction and relevant studies of teacher job satisfaction are discussed.

Theories of Job Satisfaction

The subject of job satisfaction has been widely studied by business management, behavioral scientists, and educational researchers. Cranny et al. (1992) stated, "There appears to be general agreement that job satisfaction is an affective (that is emotional) reaction to a job that results from the incumbent's comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired (expected, deserved, and so on)" (p. 1). Some instruments used in measuring job satisfaction give an overall or general job satisfaction score which is a function of a variety of features of the work environment (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). Other instruments yield composite or specific measures of certain aspects of work and the environment.

Motivation

Motivation is generally considered to be rooted in human needs although the relationship between needs and motivation is not altogether clear. Motivation is an intervening variable between human needs and behavior. Behavior is the means by which individuals seek to satisfy physical and psychological human needs. While unmet needs may motivate individuals, it is the met needs that satisfy them (Maslow, 1970). Administrators must recognize the needs that motivate the behavior of teachers in schools and, when met, give satisfaction to teachers. Using "carrot and stick" motivation based on an authoritarian principle or relying on teacher altruism and volunteerism alone is an inappropriate basis of motivation for professional teachers.

The need for individuals to fulfill diverse personal needs may clash with an organization's need to accomplish a specific task (Getzels & Guba, 1957). School leaders face the challenge of structuring teaching to accomplish the organizational need to educate students while satisfying the personal needs of teachers.

In the 1920s, the Hawthorne studies at the Western Electric plant sought to understand better what motivates workers to higher levels of performance and how to apply this knowledge to improve organizational leadership behavior. Contemporary analysis of the Hawthorne studies suggests the higher productivity resulted from workers' empowerment and participation with management in decision making resulting in a group cohesiveness, morale, and sense of values that were highly motivating to workers in performing their work (Owens, 1991).

Theoretical Frameworks

In a meta-analysis of job satisfaction studies, Thompson, McNamara, and Hoyle (1997) identified three groups of theoretical frameworks of job satisfaction. These three groups include content theories, process or discrepancy theories, and situational theories.

Content theories attempt to explain job satisfaction in terms of needs that must be satisfied or values that must be attained (Locke, 1976). Maslow's (1970) Need Hierarchy Theory and Herzberg's (1966) Two-Factor Theory are examples of content theories. Process theories attempt to explain job satisfaction in terms of how expectancies, values, or needs relate to or combine to cause job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). As an outgrowth, discrepancy theories explain job satisfaction as the difference between an individual's desired work outcomes and what an individual actually receives in the organization (Locke, 1976) or as the difference between an individual's work motivation and organizational incentives (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Porter and Lawler's (1968) Need Satisfaction Theory and Vroom's (1964) Expectancy Model are examples of process and discrepancy theories of job satisfaction. Situational models of job satisfaction attempt to explain how categories of variables such as task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and individual characteristics combine to relate to job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Situational Occurrences Theory (Quarstein et al., 1992), Predictors of Job Satisfaction (Glisson & Durick, 1988), and the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1980) are examples of situational theories.

Content theories of job satisfaction

Abraham Maslow (1970) described a hierarchy of five needs which humans seek to satisfy by certain behaviors. Maslow defined motivation as a natural drive to satisfy these human needs. His hierarchy consists of the following: (a) basic physiological needs of food, water, and shelter; (b) physical safety and financial security; (c) social affiliation which consists of love, belonging, and acceptance by others; (d) esteem of self and recognition by peers; and (e) self-actualization defined as maximizing potential, autonomy, and self direction. Once a lower level need is satisfied, that level need no longer serves as a motivator. The next higher-level need becomes the prepotent motivator.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory has achieved great popularity and is widely accepted, although little research exists to support it, possibly because of definitional and methodological problems (Miskel & Ogawa, 1988). Practical difficulties such as multiple needs acting as motivators are problematic.

Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory of motivation and job satisfaction is composed of motivating and maintenance (hygiene) factors. Motivating factors (achievement, advancement, the work itself, growth, responsibility, recognition) were found to lead to job satisfaction when present or to a neutral state of no satisfaction when such factors were absent. Maintenance or hygiene factors (work environment, supervision, salary, fringe benefits, job security) were found to lead to a neutral state of no dissatisfaction when present or a state of dissatisfaction when absent. This preventive quality led to them being called "hygiene" factors. Maintenance factors can reduce or

eliminate dissatisfaction and create conditions which can lead to job satisfaction but are not motivating and satisfying in themselves. Herzberg's maintenance factors correspond to Maslow's lower level needs, and his motivating factors correspond to Maslow's higher level needs.

Herzberg argues that the factors that lead to job satisfaction are separate and distinct from those that lead to job dissatisfaction. He proposed that job-content-related factors bring satisfaction and job-context-related factors bring job dissatisfaction. His theory holds that job-content-related factors--the work itself--are what motivate workers.

Thus, based on Herzberg's theory, if the first three stages of Maslow's hierarchy of needs are satisfied for teachers with salary, fringes, and working conditions, the prevention of teacher dissatisfaction is the best case scenario. These extrinsic "hygiene" factors prevent dissatisfaction, but their presence does not satisfy. Factors that satisfy and motivate by fulfilling ego stage and self-actualization stage needs may be absent from many teaching jobs. The lack of opportunity for promotion, a sense of achievement, recognition for excellence in performance, and the absence of increased responsibility cause many to look to job markets other than teaching (Kaiser, 1985).

Herzberg (1976) suggested an organization may increase worker satisfaction by (a) enriching the job, making it more interesting, varied, and challenging; (b) increasing autonomy with participation in decision making about work; and (c) focusing personnel administration on motivational factors rather than just on maintenance factors. Thus, participation in teacher leadership roles may provide opportunities for teachers to be

intrinsically motivated by work that allows recognition, advancement, responsibility, growth, and achievement. Teacher leadership roles may also provide opportunities for fulfillment of Maslow's higher order needs of esteem and self-actualization. Herzberg proposed that satisfaction at work arises from the work itself. Herzberg's theory has been tested numerous times and appears well supported (Schmidt, 1976; Sergiovanni & Carver, 1973).

Process or discrepancy theories

Process or discrepancy theories of job satisfaction, also referred to as expectancy models of motivation, suggest that workers anticipate or expect that certain behaviors will result in predictable and desirable rewards. Vroom (1964) and Porter and Lawler (1968) developed two process/discrepancy theories that are cited as being quantitatively and technically complex methodologies (Owens, 1991).

The best known model of expectancy theory of motivation was developed by Victor Vroom (1964). His theory focuses on rational expectations held by the worker that certain behaviors will likely produce predictable and desirable rewards. Vroom defined valence as what an individual wants from his or her job, or the value or level of preference one has for a potential outcome. Outcome means the consequence of one's behavior. Outcome is the direct consequence of one's behavior, usually what is sought by the employer but also involving the personal impact on the individual worker. Expectancy is the belief that a behavior will result in a predictable outcome. Instrumentality refers to the correlation between the direct consequence of one's behavior (usually the outcome sought by the organization) and the personal impact on the

individual. The theory proposes that the intensity of motivation depends on a complex interplay of valence, expectancy, and instrumentality. Workers are motivated by expected events and likely outcomes of alternative ways of responding to them. Through experience individuals learn the likely consequences of their behavior and modify their responses accordingly. Shared values, trust, and common goals seem to be contributing factors affecting motivation of employees in an organization and contributing to satisfaction resulting from work.

Porter and Lawler (1968) described an expectancy model of motivation that proposes the value a worker places on the expected reward and the likelihood that the reward actually will be received if the effort is made determines the effort one puts into his or her work. Such effort necessitates that the worker possess the necessary abilities and traits and has an accurate perception of his or her role.

The combination of wanting a reward and the perceived probability of actually receiving the reward results in a certain level of effort by the worker. This effort, along with the worker's abilities and traits and role perception, results in actual job performance or job accomplishment. Based upon performance, the individual is rewarded. Rewards can be both intrinsic and extrinsic. The worker then judges the equity of the reward based on his own values and expectations. This perceived level of equity determines some level of job satisfaction. The Porter-Lawler (1968) model suggests that performance leads to satisfaction and that the level of satisfaction determines future effort by a worker to perform.

Situational models of job satisfaction

Situational models of job satisfaction have been used in more recent studies, gaining popularity since the 1980s. These models of job satisfaction attempt to explain how categories of variables unique to a situation such as task characteristics, organizational characteristics, and individual characteristics combine to relate to or predict job satisfaction (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Hackman and Oldham (1980) developed a Job Characteristic Model. The research of Quarstein et al. (1992) tested the Situational Occurrences Theory of Job Satisfaction. Glisson and Durick's (1988) work utilized predictors of job satisfaction.

Hackman and Oldham's (1980) Job Characteristics Model of work motivation proposed that positive personal and work outcomes such as high internal work motivation, "growth" satisfaction, general job satisfaction, and high work effectiveness are obtained when the individual has experienced critical psychological states. These critical psychological states are experienced when core job characteristics are present. For example, core job characteristics of skill variety, task identity, and task significance lead to experiencing the critical psychological state of work meaningfulness; autonomy leads to experiencing responsibility for work outcomes; and feedback about the job leads to knowledge of the actual results of the work activities. Individual differences such as knowledge and skill, growth need strength, and "context" satisfactions moderate a worker's psychological states and impact on the outcomes of internal work motivation, satisfaction, and effectiveness. Like Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, Hackman and Oldham's model assumes that the job itself is a powerful motivator.

Whereas Herzberg (1966) maintained job satisfaction is a function of work features alone, more recent researchers see it as an outcome of the interaction between the job and the individual. Hackman and Oldham (1980) have developed the most influential conceptualization of the work redesign-satisfaction relationship. They viewed job satisfaction as contingent on the interaction of work experiences and personal values--an outcome of the interaction between the job and the individual. Hackman and Oldham suggested a close relationship between intrinsic features of the work itself (i.e., autonomy, task identity and significance, and skill variety), the psychological state of the individual (i.e., needs, values, and knowledge of results), and affective work outcome (i.e., job satisfaction and internal motivation). Job satisfaction corresponds to the fit or congruence between the worker's values and the work itself. The extrinsic and intrinsic rewards of a job and the value a worker places on them vary, but both are factors in explaining a worker's job satisfaction.

The Situational Occurrences Theory of job satisfaction holds that job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction is determined by "situational characteristics" and "situational occurrences" (Quarstein et al., 1992). Situational characteristics consists of job facets that applicants tend to evaluate prior to accepting a job, namely pay, promotional opportunities, working conditions, company policies, supervision, and the work itself. Situational characteristics are relatively stable or permanent aspects of the work environment and are expensive and difficult to change. These job facets are fairly universal across organizations and finite in number. Most employees accept a position

believing situational characteristics meet their wants and needs and will react vocally and emotionally if changed after being hired.

Situational occurrences consist of positive and negative job facets unknown or hidden to the worker until actually on the job. Examples involve job facets such as coffee breaks, broken equipment, or confusing memos. Situational occurrences are not part of the organization's policies and tend to be easy and inexpensive to change. Situational occurrences are situationally specific and potentially infinite in number. Employee reaction to unsatisfactory situational occurrences is initially neutral but accumulates over time. Overall satisfaction with situational characteristics and situational occurrences depends on expectancy and valence or importance of the specific situational variables to each worker.

Situational Occurrences Theory focuses solely on the determinants of job satisfaction. The theory posits that job satisfaction is a function of a relatively finite and stable set of variables called situational characteristics and a broader based fluid set of variables called situational occurrences and that together they predict job satisfaction better than by either alone. Once employed, situational occurrences became more dominant as a determinant of overall job satisfaction. Gender differences were found in regard to the importance of the two types of variables. Females placed much more importance on situational occurrences than did males.

Glisson and Durick's (1988) research sought to test multiple variables as predictors of job satisfaction for workers in human service organizations. These variables were divided into three groups: characteristics of the job tasks performed by workers,

characteristics of the organization in which the tasks were performed, and characteristics of the workers who perform the tasks. Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as the "positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1300). Keeping Locke's definition in mind, Glisson and Durick found that job task characteristics were the major factors that influence job experiences and, thus, a worker's job satisfaction.

Variables that characterize the job tasks have received the most empirical attention in predictive studies of worker job satisfaction (Glick, Jenkens, & Gupta, 1986). Two variables that are strongest predictors of satisfaction are role ambiguity (Glisson & Durick, 1988; Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970) and skill variety and complexity (Gerhart, 1987; Glisson & Durick, 1988; Hackman & Oldham, 1976). These results suggest that the more workers are clear about job responsibilities and the more they are allowed to use their abilities in nonroutine work, the more satisfaction they will derive from their work. Role conflict, task identity, and task significance are other job task characteristics that predict satisfaction (Glisson & Durick, 1988; Hackman & Oldham, 1976; Katz, 1978; Rizzo et al., 1970).

Two variables that characterize the organization and have significant predictive effects on job satisfaction are leadership (Gladstein, 1984; Glisson & Durick, 1988) and supervision (Brass, 1981; Lopez, 1982). These variables refer to those in authority in the organization under which workers carry out their job tasks. Additionally, Glisson and Durick (1988) found little empirical support for the importance of individual worker

characteristics, specifically age and sex, as predictors of job satisfaction within the ranks of human service organizations.

Job Satisfaction Studies

Educational researchers have displayed great interest in the study of job satisfaction. A search of the ERIC database for journal articles and documents concerning teachers and job satisfaction revealed 490 entries since 1988.

In early research, Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) studied the operating need levels of teachers and found that overall the lower order needs in Maslow's hierarchy had been satisfied but the higher order needs of esteem, autonomy, and self-actualization were unmet. Some differences were noted by teachers' ages. For example, the youngest teachers were concerned with esteem. Middle-aged teachers (25-34 years) had the most unmet needs and reported little opportunity for professional growth, advancement within the ranks of teacher, or significant achievement in the years to come. Older teachers (at least 45 years of age) seemed to be resigned to things as they were. Rather than experiencing more job fulfillment from having higher level needs met, older teachers were actually expecting less from their work and thus appeared to be getting more satisfaction and fulfillment than existed. The significance of their findings is that teachers have motivating needs that must be continually addressed if they are to achieve feelings of professional self-worth, competence, respect, accomplishment, and influence in the workplace.

Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) supported Herzberg's ideas in that achievement, recognition, responsibility, growth opportunities, and the work itself were found to be

important motivating factors for teachers. However, they also found advancement or promotion in a teaching career missing as a motivating factor for teachers.

Porter (1961) used Maslow's theory as a basis for studying the job satisfaction of middle managers. Porter revamped Maslow's hierarchy to include autonomy, in addition to needs of security, affiliation, esteem, and self-actualization. He then measured to what extent a worker's needs were being met by a job and to what extent the worker thought the job should meet his needs. The difference measured either the job satisfaction or the perceived need deficiency being experienced by the worker. Porter's study was an effort to understand the relationship between need satisfaction and the performance of workers on the job. He found that human behavior seeks to fulfill unsatisfied needs. If lower order needs are already satisfied, work (job performance) must appeal to higher order needs if it is to be motivating and satisfying to the worker.

In a study of California teachers, McLaughlin and Yee (1988) concluded that teachers "conceive of career and define career satisfaction largely in subjective terms. . . . Teachers generate an expertise-based, individually determined notion of career; advancement is framed in terms of an ongoing process of professional growth, and success means effectiveness in the teaching role" (p. 26). This is in contrast to a hierarchical, institutionally constructed, concept of a career which primarily means upward mobility and increased salary. Other researchers found similar internally defined notions of career success and satisfaction arising from a service ethic and intangible benefits from making a difference in the lives of students (Bilken, 1986; Lortie, 1975). McLaughlin and Yee (1988) emphasized to policy makers that a teaching career is multifaceted and

individualistic in nature and that rewards and advancement must come from the challenge of the work itself.

School environments that provide opportunity and capacity which encourage professional development and effectiveness and lateral and temporary moves create rewarding and satisfying careers. School environments that are resource-adequate rather than resource-deprived, integrated rather than segmented, collegial rather than isolated, problem-solving rather than problem-hiding; and investment-centered rather than payoff focused permit and encourage teachers to be involved, challenged, growing, and effective (Kanter, 1983; McLaughlin & Pfeiffer, 1988).

Current literature is fairly optimistic about the ability of work redesign to enhance the satisfaction of teachers (Louis & Smith, 1990; Malen, Murphy, & Hart, 1987). Louis and Smith suggested that teacher work redesign involving mentor teaching and teacher teaming enhances intrinsic rewards by allowing for the development of teachers' professional expertise and influence. Malen et al. (1987) suggested that work redesign (i.e., altering the job itself and providing continuous professional development opportunities) increases both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. They stated, "Because teachers are most responsive to intrinsic rewards the job redesign strategy is particularly compelling. . . . When effectively deployed and sustained, extrinsic benefits merge with the more salient intrinsic benefits to form a potent constellation of rewards" (pp. 128-129).

Conley and Levinson (1993) found participation in a career ladder program was associated with increased job satisfaction among more experienced teachers but not among

their less experienced counterparts. For experienced teachers, work redesign affected satisfaction primarily through opportunities to use one's own special abilities. Thus, new roles for teachers suggest that redesign may allow opportunities for experimentation whereby teachers can expand on their professional repertoire and interests.

Ellis (1988) examined the dimensions of the job of teaching to determine whether or not they met the motivational needs of teachers. Using Hackman and Oldham's (1980) core job dimensions of skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback, Ellis found those teachers who perceived a high degree of presence of the core job dimensions were more internally motivated to perform well on the job and were more satisfied with their work than those teachers who perceived their presence to a lesser degree. Female teachers saw greater significance in their jobs and had a greater degree of overall job satisfaction than male teachers. Teachers with high growth and achievement needs were less satisfied with their jobs than their counterparts with lower growth needs. Only in the areas of feedback and quality of supervision did teachers exhibit lower mean scores than national norm groups with which they were compared.

Wu and Short (1996) examined the relationship between perceptions of empowerment and job satisfaction in K-12 public school teachers. The results indicated that teachers' perceptions of their level of empowerment are significantly related to their perceptions of job satisfaction. Two dimensions of empowerment, self-efficacy and professional growth, were significant predictors of job satisfaction. Short and Rinehart (1992) cautioned that empowerment is more than involvement in decision making. Empowerment is a "complex construct including dimensions such as teacher perception of

status, self-efficacy, autonomy, impact, and opportunities for professional growth in the organization" (Short & Rinehart, as cited in Wu & Short, 1996, p. 86). Wu and Short's study reinforces an earlier study done by Klecker and Loadman (1996) which used a large sample of teachers in Ohio's Venture Capital Schools. In these restructuring schools, a high positive linear correlation was found between teacher empowerment and teacher job satisfaction. However, at least half of the variance in teacher job satisfaction was not explained by teacher empowerment. In this study, overall working conditions (hours, class size, work load, etc.) produced the lowest ratings of job satisfaction.

Kim and Loadman (1994) investigated predictors of teacher job satisfaction. Salary, opportunities for advancement, professional challenge, professional autonomy, working conditions, interaction with colleagues, and interaction with students were found to be statistically significant predictors using multiple regression analysis. These predictors of job satisfaction included both extrinsic (controlled by others) and intrinsic (a part of the activity) rewards.

Teachers who actively participate in redesigned work roles of teacher leaders, then, might expect to receive more rewards, thereby increasing their job satisfaction. However, some researchers suggested the opposite. Smylie, Brownlee-Conyers, and Crowson (1991) maintained that new roles for teacher leaders may increase ambiguity and uncertainty for teachers concerning work roles and teaching content and, thus, lead to less satisfaction.

Martin and Shehan (1989) found age and work experience to be positively related to job satisfaction in the United States' work force mainly because of the extrinsic rewards

associated with age and presumably experience. In education, Rosenholtz and Simpson (1990) found teaching experience, rather than age, determined increased extrinsic and intrinsic benefits through pay raises, increased job recognition, and more varied work roles. Delayed entry into teaching, teaching as a second career, and career interruptions explain discrepancies in experience and age.

Frase and Sorenson's research (1992) analyzed teacher job satisfaction and motivation in relation to job characteristics. Their findings revealed adequate and regular feedback from principals and coworkers was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction. Autonomy beyond one's individual classroom was strongly related to job satisfaction for many, but not all, teachers. Collegial opportunities were found to be motivating and satisfying to teachers with high growth need but not to those with medium and low growth needs. These researchers cautioned that participatory opportunities for teachers must be situational or differentiated for the individual teacher. Different teachers can view the same event as autonomy or isolation, helpful feedback or professional infringement, collegiality or imposition.

Summary

Teacher leadership challenges the traditional view of school leadership and the traditional job description of teaching. Educational reformers describe teacher leaders as an essential component to successful school restructuring (Blase & Blase, 1996; Fullan, 1993; Griffin, 1991; The Holmes Group, 1990; Lieberman & Miller, 1990). Modern schools must operate as professional workplaces where leadership is inclusive, flexible,

and varied and where practices are based on expertise, accountability, and self-regulation (Darling-Hammond et al., 1995; Griffin, 1995; Hart, 1995; Heller & Firestone, 1995; Little, 1995; Smylie, 1995). Potential leadership roles include those of mentor, teacher educator, curriculum developer, decision maker, problem solver, change agent, researcher, and knowledge builder. Teacher leadership impacts and influences educational practice beyond the individual teacher's classroom or teaching assignment.

Job satisfaction is an affective or emotional response resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences (Locke, 1976). How does redesign of teacher work role affect job satisfaction? Teachers' needs, values, and expectations--as well as the work itself and the work environment--contribute to this complex construct. Numerous theorists and researchers have attempted to explain and predict worker motivation and job satisfaction in the hopes of increasing worker commitment, stability, and productivity.

This study sought to establish a relationship between leadership roles and job satisfaction among elementary teachers. The variables of this study have undergone important changes in the past decade. The school restructuring movement has provided for work redesign resulting in new and varied opportunities for classroom teachers. Concurrently, "baby boomers" are retiring from the teaching workforce and being replaced by a generation of "postbaby boomers." These entrants to the workforce, especially women and minorities, have had expanded opportunities for college and career choice. In addition, the job of teaching has been impacted by external, societal forces. Those who are served in our public schools have more diverse and complex needs. The changes in work design, workforce, and clientele served are volatile factors in previous studies.

The contributions of this study are practical in nature. State legislators, school boards, and school administrators should consider the results of the relationships between leadership roles, job satisfaction, and specific demographic variables of teachers when developing educational policy. It is hoped that this study will lend evidence as to whether teacher leadership roles relate to or affect feelings and attitudes held by teachers about their work. Such roles could then be expanded or diminished to attract and retain teachers, to improve education in our schools, and to increase the stability and commitment of the teaching workforce.

The next chapter describes the methodology used in this research. Chapter 3 provides a description of the participants, variables, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis techniques.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The first purpose of the study was to investigate the amount of teachers' participation in leadership roles and whether differences in the amount of participation exist among teachers when compared by personal and school demographics. A second purpose was to determine how satisfied elementary teachers are with their work and whether differences in measures of job satisfaction exist among teacher when compared by personal and school demographics. A third purpose was to investigate the relationships among the variables of the study--participation in leadership roles, job satisfaction, and personal and school demographics. The final purpose was to determine whether differences exist in the means of job satisfaction measures when compared by level of participation in teacher leadership roles. This study involved only elementary classroom teachers employed in public schools.

This research addressed the following questions:

1. How actively do elementary teachers participate in teacher leadership roles?

2. How satisfied are elementary teachers with their work in terms of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction?

3. Are there significant differences in the means of participation in teacher leadership roles when analyzed by personal demographics (gender, age, ethnicity, years of

teaching experience, and academic degree) and school demographics (size, academic achievement, and socioeconomic status)?

4. Are there significant differences in the means of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction when analyzed by personal and school demographics?

5. Are there significant relationships among job satisfaction, participation in teacher leadership roles, and personal and school demographics? Does the relationship between job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles interact with the demographic variables?

6. Is there a significant difference in the means of job satisfaction measures for elementary teachers when compared by level of participation in leadership roles?

This chapter is divided into five sections. Sections provide a description of the participants, variables, instrumentation, data collection, and data analysis techniques.

Participants

The population for this study included approximately 800 elementary classroom teachers who were employed in a north central Florida school district comprised of 23 elementary schools. Approximately one-third or 270 of these elementary teachers were surveyed. A minimal acceptable sample size is 50% or 135 respondents. For the purposes of this study, the sample included only individuals who taught in kindergarten through fifth-grade classrooms during the time this study was conducted. The term classroom teacher refers to state-certified employees whose duties require instruction of students one-half time or greater. This sample excluded resource teachers such as

curriculum resource teachers, behavioral resource teachers, teachers on special assignment, media specialists, and guidance counselors.

The sample was randomly selected from a list of teachers provided by the school board. The list included the teacher's name, position, home address, and phone number. Each name on the list was given a three-digit number in sequence. Using a table of random digits, 270 numbers were randomly selected. Such a procedure is a strategy for controlling threats to external validity.

Variables

The independent variable in this study was the participation in teacher leadership roles. Opportunities for teacher leadership are various, somewhat unique to the particular site, and yet existing across school contexts. Teacher leadership may be exercised in either formally appointed and elected positions or in emergent and informal roles These roles consist of behaviors and activities that can be broadly described as teacher mentor; teacher educator; curriculum developer or designer; participative decision maker on schoolwide issues such as budget, curriculum, scheduling, and personnel; problem solver; change agent; knowledge builder; and action researcher. Teachers reported the number of leadership roles that they participated in during the past academic year on the researcher-constructed Survey of Elementary Teachers' Roles (Appendix A).

The dependent variable in this study was teacher job satisfaction. Three measures of job satisfaction are reported by the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire--extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction. Extrinsic satisfaction includes attitudes and feeling

about aspects of the job apart from the work itself, such as compensation, advancement opportunities, recognition, company policies and practices, and supervision. Intrinsic satisfaction includes attitudes and feelings about the work itself including such factors as variety, ability utilization, responsibility, creativity, independence, social service, achievement, authority, security, morality, activity level, and social status. General job satisfaction combines both extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction questions with additional questions about coworkers and working conditions.

Moderator variables included personal demographics, specifically, gender, age, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, and academic degree as well as school demographics of size, academic achievement, and socioeconomic status. A moderator variable is a special type of independent variable, a secondary independent variable selected for study to determine if it affects the relationship between the primary independent variable and the dependent variable (Tuckman, 1994). These demographic variables were obtained from the participants' survey responses and from state department of education and school board publications. Age, years of teaching experience, size of school population, academic achievement on a standardized test, and socioeconomic status determined by lunch status are considered as interval scores. Gender, ethnicity, and academic degree are true dichotomies and thus are treated as noncontinuous or categorical in nature.

Instrumentation

Teacher Leadership Roles

Since there was no questionnaire available that satisfactorily measured participation in teacher leadership roles, the researcher developed a survey instrument. The instrument, Survey of Elementary Teachers' Roles (Appendix A), consisted of a checklist of behaviors and activities describing teacher leadership roles in which a classroom teacher may have participated within the last year. Behaviors and activities were gleaned from a review of literature on teacher leadership roles in schools.

Five experienced elementary principals who were currently serving in the Florida district in which the study was conducted were asked to participate in a pilot test of the survey instrument (Appendix B). First, they were asked to determine if the behavior or activity listed was an appropriate and accurate statement of teacher leadership. Second, they were asked to weigh the amount of leadership that they believed was needed to fulfill that particular role. The weighted value of each leadership role was the mean of assessment of the five principals' weightings (Appendix B). Weightings were as follows: 0 = no leadership involved in role, 1 = minimal leadership participation role, 2 = moderate leadership participation role, and 3 = major leadership participation role. This panel of principals was also given the opportunity to suggest additional teacher leadership roles that were not included in the list. All items were analyzed, and only those with a weighted value of .60 or higher were included in the final instrument. Thus,

the pilot study established content validity and provided a weighted value for each leadership role.

Responses to the checklist were converted to an interval scale by totaling the number of favorable weighted responses as the respondent's score. The total or cumulative number of favorable weighted responses made by an individual on a questionnaire then became an indication of the frequency of agreement by that participant--an interval measure (Tuckman, 1994).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured by the short form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). The University of Minnesota, Vocational Psychology Research, will not grant permission for this copyrighted instrument to be published in dissertation research.

The MSQ was developed to measure an individual's satisfaction with 20 different aspects of the work environment. These 20 aspects of job satisfaction include ability utilization, achievement, activity, advancement, authority, company policies and practices, compensation, coworkers, creativity, independence, moral values, recognition, responsibility, security, social service, social status, supervision--human relations, supervision--technical, variety, and working conditions (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967).

The MSQ uses a 5-point Likert scale and yields interval data. The participants' response choices include very dissatisfied, dissatisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied,

satisfied, and very satisfied. The MSQ gives subscale scores for intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and a general job satisfaction score.

In the test manual, Weiss et al. (1967) made the following statements concerning reliability and validity:

1. Hoyt reliability coefficients were used to establish internal consistency for the short-form MSQ. "Median reliability coefficients were .86 for Intrinsic Satisfaction, .80 for Extrinsic Satisfaction and .90 for General Satisfaction" (p. 24).

2. "Test-retest correlation of General Satisfaction scale scores yielded coefficients of .89 over a one-week period and .70 over a one-year interval" (p. 24).

3. "Since the short-form MSQ is based on a subset of the long-form items, validity for the short-form may in part be inferred from validity on the long-form" (p. 24). "Evidence for the validity of the MSQ is derived mainly from its performing according to theoretical expectations" (p. 16), also known as construct validity. The hypothesis stated that satisfaction is a function of the correspondence between the individual's needs and the reinforcer system of the job. A high need/high reinforcement group would express the most satisfaction and the high need/low reinforcement group would express the least satisfaction.

4. "Evidence for the concurrent validity of the MSQ is derived from the study of group differences in satisfaction, especially occupational differences in satisfaction" (p. 18). Across 25 occupational groups, group differences were statistically significant at the .001 level for both means and variances on all MSQ scales.

5. "Factor analytic results . . . support the content validity of the MSQ" (p. 22). Content validity is the extent to which inferences from a test's scores adequately represent the conceptual domain that the test is claimed to measure.

Bolton (1984) asserted that one indication of the quality of a psychometric instrument is the extent of usage in published research. After searching bibliographies for journals, dissertations, and other research studies, Bolton found the MSQ was one of the two most widely used measurements of job satisfaction in industrial and organizational research.

Demographics

The survey instrument was designed to obtain demographic information about the participants (Appendix A). Data concerning gender, age, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, and highest academic degree were obtained by the survey. Gender was coded male or female. Respondents were asked to describe their age according to categories: 20-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, 60 or over. Ethnicity was tabulated as white/Caucasian, black/Afro-American, Hispanic, or other. Respondents were asked to indicate their years of teaching experience according to the following categories: 1-5 years, 6-10 years, 11-15 years, 16-20 years, 21-25 years, 26 years or over. Highest academic degree was tabulated as bachelor's degree, master's degree, specialist degree, or doctoral degree.

For each school, the population size and the percentage of students on free/reduced-price lunch was provided by The Florida Department of Education in the *Florida School Indicators Report* (1997) (Appendix C). The percentage of students on free/reduced-price lunch was used as an indication of the socioeconomic status of a

school. Academic achievement was determined by the Reading means from the 1997 Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Grade 2) which was published by the district school board (Appendix D).

Data Collection

A description of the research proposal was submitted for review to the University of Florida Institutional Review Board. Approval was granted to conduct this study (Appendix E).

The questionnaire, along with a cover letter and a stamped, return-addressed envelope, was sent to 270 randomly selected elementary teachers by first-class mail. The cover letter included an explanation of the purpose of the study, a privacy disclaimer which guaranteed the confidentiality of the participants, and a brief explanation of the code number on the questionnaire for the purpose of sending follow-up letters to those who do not respond. In addition to a request for respondent's help, the letter sought to establish the legitimacy of the study and to set a deadline for return of the survey (Appendix A).

Approximately 2 weeks after the receipt of the initial mailing, a second mailing was made to those respondents who had not replied. The second mailing included another letter soliciting cooperation. A second survey and stamped, returned-addressed envelope was sent to those teachers so requesting.

Data Analysis

Responses to the survey instrument for participation in teacher leadership roles and job satisfaction were assessed primarily by quantitative methods. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was employed to analyze the research data. The survey included two open-ended questions which asked teachers to comment about the most and least satisfying aspects of teaching. Some qualitative analysis was employed in discussing these questions.

Descriptive statistics were used to answer Question 1. The mean and standard deviation for measures of participation in teacher leadership roles were given for the total sample and for groups based on personal and school demographics (Appendix F). In addition, frequency count and percentage of teachers participating were given for each leadership role contained on the survey.

Descriptive statistics were used to answer Question 2. The mean and standard deviation for measures of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general satisfaction were given for the total sample and for groups based on personal and school demographics (Appendix F).

Questions 3 and 4 were answered by using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). In Question 3, one-way ANOVA determined whether the means of participation in leadership roles of the different demographic groups were equivalent in the population or differ, reflecting the effect of the demographic variable. In Question 4, one-way ANOVA determined whether the means of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job

satisfaction of the different demographic groups were equivalent in the population or differ, reflecting the effect of the demographic variable.

Correlation and multiple regression analysis were used to answer Question 5. The Pearson product-moment correlation is used to measure the linear relationship between two variables that are measured on interval scales. The Spearman rank correlation shows the direction and magnitude of the linear relationship of ranks between two variables that are not all on continuous scales. Multiple regression analysis is a statistical method for studying the relation between a dependent variable and a combination of two or more independent variables (Shavelson, 1996). Multiple regression analysis is the appropriate statistical procedure to establish a functional relationship between the dependent variable of job satisfaction and a set of independent variables, specifically participation in teacher leadership roles, gender, age, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, academic degree, school size, student academic achievement, and school socioeconomic status. Multiple regression analysis reveals how well each of two or more independent variables predict the dependent variable. This study utilized multiple regression to analyze job satisfaction against a set of independent variables to determine which independent variables have the most significant relationships with job satisfaction for elementary teachers.

One-way analysis of variance was used to answer Question 6. Three separate analyses of variance were performed to assess the differences in extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction across level of participation in leadership roles.

Summary

This study involved a survey of elementary teachers from one midsized Florida school district. A questionnaire gathered data on participation in teacher leadership roles, teacher job satisfaction, and demographic variables.

Chapter 4 presents the data collected by the study's survey of elementary teachers. The first section provides the results of demographic information in a population profile. The second section provides answers to the research questions presented in the study. A third section qualitatively reports the open-ended survey questions concerning the most and least satisfying aspects of being an elementary teacher.

CHAPTER 4
ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter presents an analysis of the data gathered as a result of this study. The first purpose of the study was to investigate the amount of teachers' participation in leadership roles and whether differences in the amount of participation exist among teachers when compared by personal and school demographics. A second purpose was to determine how satisfied elementary teachers are with their work and whether differences in measures of job satisfaction exist among teacher when compared by personal and school demographics. A third purpose was to investigate the relationships among the variables of the study--participation in leadership roles, job satisfaction, and personal and school demographics. The final purpose was to determine whether differences exist in the means of job satisfaction measures when compared by level of participation in teacher leadership roles. This study involved only elementary classroom teachers employed in public schools.

This research addressed the following questions:

1. How actively do elementary teachers participate in teacher leadership roles?

2. How satisfied are elementary teachers with their work in terms of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general satisfaction?

3. Are there significant differences in the means of participation in teacher leadership roles when analyzed by personal demographics (gender, age, ethnicity, years of

teaching experience, and academic degree) and school demographics (size, academic achievement, and socioeconomic status)?

4. Are there significant differences in the means of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction when analyzed by personal and school demographics?

5. Are there significant relationships among job satisfaction, participation in teacher leadership roles, and personal and school demographics? Does the relationship between job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles interact with the demographic variables?

6. Is there a significant difference in the means of job satisfaction measures for elementary teachers when compared by level of participation in leadership roles?

Survey Response

A questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of elementary classroom teachers employed in 23 schools in a district in north central Florida. Of the 270 surveys mailed, 143 surveys were returned for a 53% return rate. Of the surveys returned, 140 or 51.9% of the total number mailed provided useable data.

This chapter presents the results of the survey. The first section provides the results of demographic information in a population profile. The second section provides answers to the research questions presented in the study. A third section qualitatively reports the open-ended survey questions concerning the most and least satisfying aspect of being an elementary teacher.

Population Profile

Table 1 provides the distribution of elementary teachers by gender. Of the total participants, 13 (9.4%) were male and 126 (90.6%) were female. One participant did not complete this question.

Table 2 provides the distribution of elementary teachers by age. Of the total participants, 25 (18.0%) were 20-29 years of age, 24 (17.3%) were 30-39 years of age, 47 (33.8%) were 40-49 years of age, 39 (28.1%) were 50-59 years of age, and 4 (2.9%) were 60 years or older. One participant chose not to complete this question.

Table 1

Elementary Teachers: Distribution by Gender n = 139

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	13	9.4
Female	126	90.6

Table 2

Elementary Teachers: Distribution by Age n = 139

Age	Frequency	Percentage
20-29 years	25	18.0
30-39 years	24	17.3
40-49 years	47	33.8
50-59 years	39	28.1
60 years and over	4	2.9

Table 3 provides the distribution of teachers by the number of years of teaching experience. All survey participants completed this question. The survey revealed 33 (23.6%) teachers with 1-5 years of teaching experience, 22 (15.7%) teachers with 6-10 years of teaching experience, 16 (11.4%) teachers with 11-15 years of teaching experience, 18 (12.9%) teachers with 16-20 years of teaching experience, 26 (18.6%) teachers with 21-25 years of teaching experience, and 25 (17.9%) teachers with 26 years or more teaching experience.

Table 3

Elementary Teachers: Distribution by Years of Teaching Experience n = 140

Years of Teaching Experience	Frequency	Percentage
1-5 years	33	23.6
6-10 years	22	15.7
11-15 years	16	11.4
16-20 years	18	12.9
21-25 years	26	18.6
26 years and over	25	17.9

Table 4 provides the distribution of elementary teachers by highest academic degree received. In this survey, 51 (36.4%) elementary teachers held a bachelor's degree, 82 (58.6%) elementary teachers held a master's degree, and 7 (5.0%) elementary teachers held a specialist degree. No participants had obtained a doctorate degree. For data analysis these categories have been collapsed into two groups—bachelor's and master's and above.

Table 5 provides the distribution of elementary teachers by ethnic group. In this study, 128 (92.1%) of the elementary teachers described themselves as white/Caucasian, and 8 (5.8%) described themselves as black/Afro-American. No participant indicated belonging to a Hispanic ethnic group. Three participants (2.2%) indicated the category of Other. One participant did not respond to the question. For data analysis these categories have been collapsed into two groups—white/Caucasian and other.

Table 4

Elementary Teachers: Distribution by Highest Academic Degree n = 140

Highest Academic Degree	Frequency	Percentage
Bachelor's	51	36.4
Master's	82	58.6
Specialist	7	5.0
Doctorate	0	0.0

Table 5

Elementary Teachers: Distribution by Ethnic Group n = 139

Ethnic Group	Frequency	Percentage
White/Caucasian	128	92.1
Black/AfroAmerican	8	5.8
Hispanic	0	0.0
Other	3	2.2

Table 6 provides the distribution of elementary teachers by the size of the school where the participant teaches. Of the total participants, 54 (38.6%) teachers taught in schools of less than 550 students, 45 (32.1%) teachers taught in schools with between 550 and 700 students, and 41 (29.3%) taught in schools that were larger than 700 students. Less than 550 students is considered a small size school. A school between 550 and 700 students is considered a medium size school. More than 700 students is considered a large school. These categories divide the distribution approximately into thirds. School size was determined by the Florida Department of Education and published in the *Florida School Indicators Report*.

Table 6

Elementary Teachers: Distribution by Size of School n = 140

Size of School	Frequency	Percentage
< 550 Students	54	38.6
550-700 Students	45	32.1
> 700 Students	41	29.3

Table 7 provides the distribution of elementary teachers based on the mean reading achievement scores from the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (Grade 2) from the year in which the study was done. Of the total participants, 43 (30.7%) teachers taught in schools with a reading mean of less than 50, 42 (30.0%) taught in schools with a reading mean between 50 and 66, and 55 (39.3%) taught in schools with a reading mean of 67 and

above. These scores delineate low, middle, and high reading achievement levels, respectively. These categories reflect points at which breaks in the data distribution occur. These data for school sites were provided by the school district in which the study occurred.

Table 7

Elementary Teachers: Distribution by School Mean Reading Achievement Scores (Grade 2) n = 140

Mean Reading Scores	Frequency	Percentage
below 50	43	30.7
50-66	42	30.0
67 and above	55	39.3

Table 8 provides the distribution of elementary teachers by the socioeconomic status of their school based on the percentage of students qualifying for free and reduced-price lunch as reported by the Florida Department of Education in the *Florida School Indicators Report*. In this study, 25 (17.9%) teachers worked in a school with less than 38% of its student population qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch price (considered high socioeconomic status schools); 64 (45.7%) teachers worked in a school with free and reduced-price lunch students ranging from 38% to 65% of its population (considered middle socioeconomic status schools); and 51 (36.4%) teachers worked in a school with more than 65% of its students qualifying for free and reduced-price lunch price (considered low socioeconomic status schools). These categories, although somewhat

arbitrary, reflect schools with approximately one-third or less and two-thirds or more of the student population on free and reduced-price lunch.

Table 8

Elementary Teachers: Distribution by School Socioeconomic Status (SES) Based on Percentage of Students on Free and Reduced-Price Lunch n = 140

Free/Reduced-Price Lunch	Frequency	Percentage
< 38% (High SES)	25	17.9
Between 38% and 65% (Middle SES)	64	45.7
>65% (Low SES)	51	36.4

Research Questions

Question 1

Research question 1 investigated how actively elementary teachers participate in teacher leadership roles. To address this question, part of the questionnaire, the Survey of Elementary Teachers' Roles, was analyzed in several ways. First, the frequency and percentage of teachers from the sample participating in each of 18 leadership roles was determined. Second, the mean, median, mode, and range for the number of leadership roles was determined. Third, the mean and standard deviation for the weighted value for teacher leadership roles was determined.

Table 9 gives the frequency and percentage of teachers participating in each of the leadership roles found on the survey. Eighteen distinct leadership roles were surveyed and are listed in descending order of frequency.

Table 9

Teacher Leadership Roles: Frequency and Percentage of Teacher Participation

Teacher Leadership Role	Frequency	Percentage
Active participant in schoolwide decision making	67	47.9
Supervising teacher for university intern student	48	34.3
Team leader, department head, or Title 1 lead teacher	45	32.1
Developer of curriculum ideas adapted by others	40	28.6
Inservice presenter for other teachers	35	25.0
Grant writer for funded project	33	23.6
Workshop presenter for parents/community	29	20.7
Mentor teacher for beginning teacher	26	18.6
Student in graduate level course	19	13.6
Representative on a district committee	18	12.9
Officer or chair in an educational organization	18	12.9
School advisory council representative	17	12.1
Union bargaining team member or building representative	15	10.7
Participant in a pilot study	12	8.6
Presenter at a seminar/conference on an education topic	10	7.1
Lead teacher during extended school year	8	5.7
Action researcher concerning classroom practice	5	3.6
Author of a published article concerning education	2	1.4

For the school year in which the survey was done, the sample mean for the number of teacher leadership roles was 3.16. The sample median or middle number where half of the observations are less and half are greater for teacher leadership roles was 3. The sample mode or most often occurring number of teacher leadership roles was 1.

The spread of distribution was measured by calculating the range and quartiles. The range for leadership roles was 0 to a high of 11 for a range of 11. The quartiles mark out the middle half of the data. The first quartile was 1. The third quartile was 5.

Table 10 gives the five number summary of the data for teacher leadership roles. This summary consists of the smallest observation, the first quartile, the median, the third quartile, and the largest observation. These five numbers offer a reasonably complete description of center and spread (Moore, 1995).

Table 10

Teacher Leadership Roles: Center and Spread

Minimum	First Quartile	Median	Third Quartile	Maximum
0	1	3	5	11

Teacher leadership roles were weighted based on the evaluation of each role by five experienced elementary principals in the district where the study was conducted. The rating scale ranged from 0 to 3--0 meaning no leadership involved in role and 3 meaning maximum amount of leadership involved in role. Appendix B gives the averaged weighted value for each role. The total possible weighted value for teacher leadership roles was 46.4.

In this study the range for weighted teacher leadership roles was 0 to 29.2. The mean for the total sample for weighted teacher leadership roles was 8.5743, and the

standard deviation for the mean of weighted teacher leadership roles was 6.6322 (Appendix F, Table 1). The means and standard deviations for all personal and school demographic groups are also found in Appendix F.

Question 2

Research question 2 investigated how satisfied elementary teachers are with their work in terms of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general satisfaction. To address this question, the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (short form) was scored according to the directions given in the administration manual. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire uses a 5-point Likert scale with choices ranging from (5) very satisfied, (4) satisfied, (3) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, (2) dissatisfied, and (1) very dissatisfied.

Table 11 gives the range, mean, and standard deviation for extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction for the total sample. The means and standard deviations for all personal and school demographic groups are found in Appendix F.

Table 11

Extrinsic, Intrinsic, and General Job Satisfaction for Elementary Teachers: Range, Mean, and Standard Deviation n = 140

Job Satisfaction	Range	Mean	Standard Deviation
Extrinsic	1.17-4.83	3.29	0.80
Intrinsic	2.67-5.00	4.18	0.46
General	2.30-4.80	3.89	0.50

Extrinsic job satisfaction involved questions about participants' feelings concerning compensation, advancement opportunities, recognition, company policies and procedures, and competence of supervisor on both personal and technical dimensions. The range was from a minimum score of 1.17 to a maximum score of 4.83. The mean score was 3.29 and the standard deviation was 0.80.

Intrinsic job satisfaction involved questions about participants' feelings concerning variety of work tasks, ability utilization, responsibility, creativity, independence, social service, achievement, authority, security, morality, activity level, and social status. The range was from a minimum score of 2.67 to a maximum score of 5.00. The mean score was 4.18 and the standard deviation was 0.46.

General job satisfaction involved 20 questions about participants' feelings concerning the previously delineated components of extrinsic and intrinsic satisfaction and additional components concerning coworkers and working conditions. The range was from a minimum score of 2.30 to a maximum score of 4.80. The mean score was 3.89 and the standard deviation was 0.50.

Question 3

Research question 3 asked whether there are significant differences in the means of participation in teacher leadership roles when analyzed by personal demographics (gender, age, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, and academic degree) and school demographics (size, academic achievement, and socioeconomic status)?

Table 12 lists the one-way analyses of variance to assess the difference in leadership roles when analyzed by personal and school demographic variables. There was a significant difference at the 0.05 alpha level between levels of years of teaching experience. There were no significant differences found for categories or levels of gender, age, academic degree, ethnicity, school size, student reading achievement, and school socioeconomic status based on free and reduced-price lunch percentages at the 0.05 alpha level.

Table 12

Analyses of Variance to Assess the Difference in Leadership Roles

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	P Value
Gender	1, 137	60.6097	60.6097	1.37	0.2433
Age	4, 134	168.2364	42.0591	0.95	0.4355
Yrs.Teaching	5, 134	710.6217	142.1243	3.52	0.0050*
Acad. Degree	1, 138	4.5073	4.5073	0.10	0.7502
Ethnicity	1, 137	0.6651	0.6651	0.02	0.9024
School Size	2, 137	135.5604	67.7802	1.55	0.2153
Read. Ach.	2, 137	116.7142	58.3571	1.33	0.2671
Free Lunch	2, 137	24.3828	12.1914	0.27	0.7605

*significant at the 0.05 level

Tukey's multiple comparison test revealed that those teachers who taught 1-5 years had a significantly smaller leadership role score than those teachers with 16-20 and 21-25 years of teaching experience. All other groupings were not significantly different from each other (Table 13).

Table 13

Tukey's Multiple Comparison Test: Teacher Leadership Roles with Regard to Levels of Years of Teaching

Years of Teaching	Mean	Contrast Significance					
Levels		1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26+
1-5	5.2364	--					
6-10	7.9727	0.6225	--				
11-15	10.2250	0.1097	0.8888	--			
16-20	11.3222	0.0168*	0.5608	0.9960	--		
21-25	10.9538	0.0101*	0.5865	0.9992	1.0000	--	
26+	8.0000	0.5728	1.0000	0.8829	0.5392	0.5601	--

*significant at the 0.05 level

Question 4

Research question 4 asked if there are significant differences in the means of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction measures when analyzed by personal and school demographics. Three separate groups of analyses of variance were performed to assess differences.

Table 14 lists the one-way analyses of variance to assess the difference in extrinsic job satisfaction when analyzed by personal and school demographic variables. There were significant differences at the 0.05 alpha level with respect to gender, school size, student reading achievement, and school socioeconomic status based on percentage of students qualifying for free and reduced-price lunch. There were no significant differences found for categories or levels of age, years of teaching experience, highest academic degree, or ethnicity.

Table 14

Analyses of Variance to Assess the Difference in Extrinsic Job Satisfaction

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	P Value
Gender	1, 137	2.5679	2.5697	4.09	0.0451*
Age	4, 134	5.5522	1.3880	2.26	0.0664
Years Teaching	5, 134	2.4653	0.4931	0.76	0.5774
Academic Degree	1, 138	0.0658	0.0658	0.10	0.7497
Ethnicity	1, 137	0.4680	0.4680	0.73	0.3959
School Size	2, 137	7.4729	3.7365	6.28	0.0025*
Reading Ach.	2, 137	10.3572	5.1786	9.03	0.0002*
Free/Reduced-Price Lunch	2, 137	4.5541	2.2771	3.70	0.0273*

*significant at the 0.05 level

Tukey's multiple comparison test revealed the following. Female teachers had significantly higher extrinsic job satisfaction (p-value = 0.0451) than male teachers (3.3316 versus 2.8646). Teachers in medium size schools had significantly less extrinsic job satisfaction than teachers in large and small schools. Teachers in schools that scored high in reading achievement had significantly higher extrinsic job satisfaction than the teachers in middle and low scoring schools. Teachers in low socioeconomic schools (high percentage of students on free/reduced-price lunch) had significantly lower extrinsic job satisfaction than teachers in high socioeconomic schools (low percentage of students on free/reduced-price lunch) (Tables 15, 16, and 17).

Table 15

Tukey's Multiple Comparison Test: Extrinsic Job Satisfaction with Regard to Levels of School Size

School Size	Mean	Contrast Significance		
Levels		Small	Medium	Large
Small	3.3978	--		
Medium	2.9631	0.0164*	--	
Large	3.5129	0.7516	0.0035*	--

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 16

Tukey's Multiple Comparison Test: Extrinsic Job Satisfaction with Regard to Levels of Academic Achievement

Academic Achievement	Mean	Contrast Significance		
Levels		Low	Middle	High
Low	3.0330	--		
Middle	3.1171	0.8657	--	
High	3.6275	0.0005*	0.0037*	--

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 17

Tukey's Multiple Comparison Test: Extrinsic Job Satisfaction with Regard to Levels of School Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic Status	Mean	Contrast Significance		
Levels		Low	Middle	High
Low	3.0671	--		
Middle	3.3736	0.0976	--	
High	3.5408	0.0387*	0.6392	--

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 18 lists the one-way analyses of variance to assess difference in intrinsic job satisfaction when analyzed by personal and school demographic variables. There was a significant difference in intrinsic job satisfaction at the 0.05 alpha level for gender. Female teachers had significantly higher intrinsic job satisfaction (p-value = 0.0049) than male teachers (4.2190 versus 3.8462). There were no significant differences in intrinsic job satisfaction found for categories or levels of age, years of teaching experience, academic degree, ethnicity, school size, school reading achievement, or school socioeconomic status (percentage of students on free or reduced-price lunch).

Table 19 lists the one-way analyses of variance to assess the difference in general job satisfaction when analyzed by personal and school demographic variables. There were significant differences in general job satisfaction at the 0.05 alpha level with respect to gender, school size, student reading achievement, and school socioeconomic status.

There were no significant differences in general job satisfaction with respect to age, years of teaching experience, academic degree, or ethnicity.

Table 18

Analyses of Variance to Assess the Difference in Intrinsic Job Satisfaction

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	P Value
Gender	1, 137	1.6379	1.6379	8.17	0.0049*
Age	4, 134	0.3281	0.0820	0.38	0.8213
Years Teaching	5, 134	0.5969	0.1194	0.56	0.7297
Academic Degree	1, 138	0.1289	0.1289	0.61	0.4348
Ethnicity	1, 137	0.1134	0.1134	0.54	0.4617
School Size	2, 137	0.8239	0.4120	2.00	0.1399
Reading Ach.	2, 137	1.0665	0.5332	2.61	0.0775
Free/Reduced-Price Lunch	2, 137	0.5213	0.2606	1.25	0.2900

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 19

Analyses of Variance to Assess the Difference in General Job Satisfaction

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	P Value
Gender	1, 137	1.7583	1.7583	7.21	0.0082*
Age	4, 134	1.3064	0.3266	1.30	0.2742
Years Teaching	5, 134	1.0563	0.2113	0.83	0.5309
Academic Degree	1, 138	0.0777	0.0777	0.31	0.5814
Ethnicity	1, 137	0.1486	0.1486	0.59	0.4453
School Size	2, 137	2.4484	1.2242	5.12	0.0072*
Reading Ach.	2, 137	3.4407	1.7203	7.42	0.0009*
Free/Reduced-Price Lunch	2, 137	1.8615	0.9308	3.83	0.0242*

*significant at the 0.05 level

Tukey's multiple comparison test revealed the following. Female teachers had significantly higher general job satisfaction (p-value = 0.0082) than male teachers (3.9263 versus 3.5400). Teachers in large schools had significantly higher job satisfaction than teachers in medium sized schools. Teachers in high reading achievement schools had significantly higher general job satisfaction than teachers in low reading achievement schools. Teachers in low socioeconomic schools (higher percentage of students qualifying for free and reduced-price lunch) had significantly less general job satisfaction than teachers in schools with middle or high socioeconomic status (lower percentages of students on free or reduced-price lunch) (Tables 20, 21, and 22).

Table 20

Tukey's Multiple Comparison Test: General Job Satisfaction with Regard to Levels of School Size

School Size	Mean	Contrast Significance		
Levels		Small	Medium	Large
Small	3.9178	--		
Medium	3.7151	0.1034	--	
Large	4.0485	0.4025	0.0055*	--

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 21

Tukey's Multiple Comparison Test: General Job Satisfaction with Regard to Levels of Academic Achievement

Academic Achievement	Mean	Contrast Significance		
Levels		Low	Middle	High
Low	3.6963	--		
Middle	3.8560	0.2806	--	
High	4.0698	0.0006*	0.0804	--

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 22

Tukey's Multiple Comparison Test: General Job Satisfaction with Regard to Levels of School Socioeconomic Status

Socioeconomic Status	Mean	Contrast Significance		
Levels		Low	Middle	High
Low	3.7410	--		
Middle	3.9609	0.0492*	--	
High	4.0176	0.0595**	0.8775	--

*significant at the 0.05 level
**significant at the 0.10 level

Question 5

Research question 5 sought to determine if there are significant relationships among job satisfaction, participation in teacher leadership roles, and the personal and school demographics considered in the study. Furthermore, the question asked if the

relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles interacts with the demographic variables.

Table 23 displays Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients and gives the p-value for testing if the correlation is different from zero. All three measures of job satisfaction were highly correlated with each other. However, none of the job satisfaction measures were significantly correlated with participation in leadership roles for elementary teachers.

Table 24 displays Spearman rank correlation coefficients between extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction, participation in leadership roles, and demographic variables of the study. Spearman rank correlation is a nonparametric way of estimating and testing for correlation. Spearman rank correlation was used since the demographic variables were not all on a continuous scale.

Table 23

Pearson Correlations Between Job Satisfaction Measures and Leadership Participation

Variables	1	2	3	4
Extrinsic Job Satisfaction	--	0.5444 (0.0001)*	0.8760 (0.0001)*	0.1220 (0.1512)
Intrinsic Job Satisfaction		--	0.8707 (0.0001)*	0.1448 (0.0879)
General Job Satisfaction			--	0.1476 (0.0819)
Leadership Roles				--

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 24

Spearman Rank Correlations Between Job Satisfaction, Leadership Roles, and Demographics

Demographics	Ext. Job Sat.	Int. Job Sat.	Gen. Job Sat.	Lead. Roles
Age	0.1384	0.0485	0.0935	0.1540
	(0.1042)	(0.5710)	(0.2734)	(0.0709)
Years Teaching Exp.	0.0818	0.0533	0.0650	0.2588
	(0.3365)	(0.5320)	(0.4454)	(0.0020)*
School Size	0.0523	0.1288	0.1210	0.0020
	(0.5391)	(0.1293)	(0.1544)	(0.9810)
Reading Achievement	0.3463	0.2302	0.3554	0.1539
	(0.0001)*	(0.0062)*	(0.0001)*	(0.0695)
Free/Reduced-Price Lunch	-0.2527	-0.1642	-0.2693	-0.0833
	(0.0026)*	(0.0525)	(0.0013)*	(0.3280)

*significant at the 0.05 level

Student reading achievement was significantly correlated with all three measures--extrinsic, intrinsic, and general--of job satisfaction. Socioeconomic status of the school was significantly correlated with extrinsic and general job satisfaction. Since socioeconomic status is inversely related to the percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch, the higher the percentage of students qualifying for free and reduced-price lunch, the lower the socioeconomic status is for the school. The significant but negative correlations between socioeconomic status (based on free and reduced-price lunch percentage) reflected this inverse relationship--the higher the free and reduced-price lunch percentage (the lower the socioeconomic school status), the lower the measures of teacher extrinsic and general job satisfaction. There was also a significant

correlation between years of teaching experience and participation in teacher leadership roles.

Multiple regression analyses were used to determine if the relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles interacted with the demographic variables of the study. For each of the analyses, a demographic variable, participation in leadership roles, and the interaction of the demographic variable and participation in leadership roles were used as predictors in the multiple regression. The response variable used was general job satisfaction.

In order to answer the question of whether the relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles interacts with the demographic variable, the significance of the interaction parameter in the model must be determined. If the F-test for the model is not significant, the model is not good as a predictor, and there is no need to look at the parameter estimates. If the F-test for the model is significant, the interaction p-value reveals whether the demographic variable interacts with the relationship between job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles.

The multiple regression analysis in Table 25 revealed a good model having a significant relationship between the independent variables and general job satisfaction. However, no significant interaction of gender with the relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles was found.

Table 25

Multiple Regression Analysis to Assess the Interaction of Gender with the Relationship Between General Job Satisfaction and Leadership Roles

Adjusted R-Square = 0.0458	Model F = 3.210		P-value = 0.0251*	
Variable	β	SE(β)	T Statistic	P-value
Intercept	3.4380	0.1993	17.2543	0.0001
Gender	0.4078	0.2122	1.9217	0.0567
Leadership Roles	0.0156	0.0222	0.7038	0.4828
Interaction	-0.0065	0.0231	-0.2794	0.7804

*significant at the 0.05 level

The multiple regression analyses in Tables 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30 revealed that the models were not a good fit. The variables had no predictive value for general job satisfaction. Therefore, the interactions of age, years of teaching, academic degree, ethnicity, and school size with the relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles were not significant.

Table 26

Multiple Regression Analysis to Assess the Interaction of Age with the Relationship Between General Job Satisfaction and Leadership Roles

Adjusted R-Square = 0.0245	Model F = 2.153		P-value = 0.0965	
Variable	β	SE(β)	T Statistic	P-value
Intercept	3.8863	0.1751	22.1891	0.0001
Age	-0.0338	0.0621	-0.5442	0.5872
Leadership Roles	-0.0150	0.0174	-0.8599	0.3914
Interaction	0.0092	0.0060	1.5370	0.1266

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 27

Multiple Regression Analysis to Assess the Interaction of Years Teaching with the Relationship Between General Job Satisfaction and Leadership Roles

Adjusted R-Square = 0.0242	Model F = 2.147		P-value = 0.0972	
Variable	β	SE(β)	T Statistic	P-value
Intercept	3.8929	0.1288	30.2183	0.0001
Years Teaching	-0.0373	0.0393	-0.9513	0.3431
Leadership Roles	-0.0115	0.0144	-0.7980	0.4262
Interaction	0.0070	0.0042	1.6911	0.0931

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 28

Multiple Regression Analysis to Assess the Interaction of Academic Degree with the Relationship Between General Job Satisfaction and Leadership Roles

Adjusted R-Square = 0.0189	Model F = 1.894		P-value = 0.1336	
Variable	β	SE(β)	T Statistic	P-value
Intercept	3.8590	0.1063	36.2917	0.0001
Academic Degree	-0.1220	0.1400	-0.8717	0.3849
Leadership Roles	0.0001	0.0096	0.0099	0.9921
Interaction	0.0196	0.0128	1.5276	0.1289

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 29

Multiple Regression Analysis to Assess the Interaction of Ethnicity with the Relationship Between General Job Satisfaction and Leadership Roles

Adjusted R-Square = 0.0024	Model F = 1.110		P-value = 0.3473	
Variable	β	SE(β)	T Statistic	P-value
Intercept	3.7913	0.0721	52.6042	0.0001
Ethnicity	0.1922	0.3589	0.5354	0.5932
Leadership Roles	0.0109	0.0066	1.6542	0.1004
Interaction	-0.0081	0.0383	-0.2119	0.8325

*significant at the 0.05 level

Table 30

Multiple Regression Analysis to Assess the Interaction of School Size with the Relationship Between General Job Satisfaction and Leadership Roles

Adjusted R-Square = 0.0283	Model F = 2.351		P-value = 0.0752	
Variable	β	SE(β)	T Statistic	P-value
Intercept	3.4675	0.1794	19.3292	0.0001
School Size	0.1709	0.0866	1.9736	0.0505
Leadership Roles	0.0361	0.0160	2.2623	0.0253
Interaction	-0.0129	0.0075	-1.7112	0.0893

*significant at the 0.05 level

Multiple regression analysis in Table 31 revealed that student reading achievement had a significant interaction with the relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in teacher leadership roles. A significant interaction indicates the correlation between general job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles changes depending on the level of student reading achievement. The interaction parameter estimate (-0.0173) corresponds to a decrease in the slope between leadership roles and general job satisfaction as reading level increases. The low and middle reading achievement groups have essentially the same correlations (0.334 and 0.275, respectively), but the high reading achievement group had a dramatically different correlation (-0.164), thus indicating the significant interaction.

Table 31

Multiple Regression Analysis to Assess the Interaction of Reading Achievement with the Relationship Between General Job Satisfaction and Leadership Roles

Adjusted R-Square = 0.1281	Model F = 7.805		P-value = 0.0001*	
Variable	β	SE(β)	T Statistic	P-value
Intercept	3.1605	0.1626	19.4421	0.0001
Reading Achievement	0.3247	0.0760	4.2718	0.0001*
Leadership Roles	0.0438	0.0156	2.8023	0.0058*
Interaction	-0.0173	0.0070	-2.4795	0.0144*

*significant at the 0.05 level

Multiple regression analysis in Table 32 revealed that school socioeconomic status had a significant interaction with the relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in teacher leadership roles. A significant interaction indicates the correlation

between general job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles changes depending on the school socioeconomic status. The interaction parameter estimate (-0.0243) corresponds to a decrease in the slope between participation in leadership roles and general job satisfaction as socioeconomic status increases. The low and middle socioeconomic status groups have relatively close correlations (0.359 and 0.231, respectively), but the high socioeconomic group had a significantly different correlation (-0.357), thus indicating the significant interaction.

Table 32

Multiple Regression Analysis to Assess the Interaction of Socioeconomic Status with the Relationship Between General Job Satisfaction and Leadership Roles

Adjusted R-Square = 0.1045	Model F = 6.408		P-value = 0.0004*	
Variable	β	SE(β)	T Statistic	P-value
Intercept	3.1707	0.1702	18.6340	0.0001
Socioeconomic Status	0.3623	0.0911	3.9775	0.0001*
Leadership Roles	0.0523	0.0152	3.4450	0.0008*
Interaction	-0.0243	0.0080	-3.0240	0.0030*

*significant at the 0.05 level

Question 6

Research question 6 asked if there is a significant difference in the means of job satisfaction measures for elementary teachers when compared by level of participation in leadership roles. A low level of participation in leadership roles ranged from weighted values of 0 to 5.0. A medium level of participation in leadership roles ranged from

weighted values of 5.1 to 11.5. A high level of participation in leadership roles ranged from weighted values of 11.6 to 29.9. Such groupings divided the sample into approximately equal groups.

Table 33 presents an analyses of variance to assess the differences across levels of participation in teacher leadership roles. Three separate analyses of variance were performed. The levels of high, medium, and low participation in teacher leadership roles were compared with respect to extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction. There were no significant differences at the 0.05 alpha level in any of the measures of job satisfaction when assessed by level of participation in leadership roles for elementary teachers.

Table 33

Analyses of Variance to Assess the Differences in Job Satisfaction Across Levels of Participation in Leadership Roles

Response	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	P Value
Ext. Job Satisfaction	2, 137	2.1131	1.0565	1.67	0.1927
Int. Job Satisfaction	2, 137	0.5317	0.2658	1.27	0.2829
Gen. Job Satisfaction	2, 137	0.8206	0.4103	1.64	0.1986

*significant at the 0.05 level

Report of Teacher Comments

The questionnaire included two open-ended questions. These questions were as follows: What is the most rewarding (satisfying) aspect of being an elementary teacher?

What is the least rewarding (satisfying) aspect of being an elementary teacher? The questions invoked many and varied responses. This section summarizes the comments of the teachers in this study.

The first open-ended question inquired about the most satisfying aspect of being an elementary teacher. From the 140 respondents, 125 teaches expressed some comment concerning the most satisfying aspect of their job. Some teachers commented about more than one aspect. Table 34 summarizes the responses to this first open-ended question concerning the most satisfying aspect of elementary teaching.

Table 34

Responses to Most Satisfying Aspects of Elementary Teaching n = 125

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Seeing students learn/progress	83	66.4
Working with children	42	33.6
Making a difference	15	12.0
Learning new things	3	2.4
Working with colleagues	3	2.4
Autonomy	2	1.6
Helping parents help their children	2	1.6
Helping peers be better teachers	2	1.6
Appreciation from parents	1	0.8
Using creative capabilities	1	0.8

A large number, 83 of the 125 teachers answering, responded that seeing students learn, progress, succeed, or grow was the most satisfying aspect of being an elementary teacher. Working with children was mentioned by 42 of the 125 teachers responding.

The two categories were considered separately since it is possible to work with students and not see learning or progress occur. The third most frequently mentioned category of comment was making a difference in the lives of students. This comment is also student centered and was made by 15 teachers.

A sampling of comments from these three most frequently mentioned categories includes the following statements: "Seeing growth in children and knowing I was a part of it." "Sharing in the lives of children and watching them grow." "Being able to work with young children to help them develop to their greatest potential." "Seeing a child's sense of awe and satisfaction when they have accomplished a task (ex., learning to read) is exhilarating and rewarding." "Believing that I have had a positive influence on the life of a child, either through academics or guidance." "Helping children feel good about themselves and their academic progress." "It is knowing I've made a difference in a child's life. When I look in their eyes and know they feel safe with me and their environment." "Watching children 'get it' when a new concept is introduced!" "Working with children and being able to make a difference in their lives." "Being with children and sharing their joy and excitement in learning." "The children--focusing just on them and their needs."

Three teachers commented that working as a member of a team and the close camaraderie that develops when the opportunity to work with other teachers is present was the most satisfying aspect of teaching. Three teachers mentioned their own learning in the teaching process was most satisfying.

The idea of helping parents help their own children with learning at home was most satisfying for two teachers. Two teachers expressed helping peers be better

teachers as the most satisfying aspect of teaching. Two teachers mentioned the autonomy that they have as classroom teachers in response to this question. One veteran teacher spoke to me concerning this comment. The idea of making her own decisions about the best way to teach her students was most satisfying to her. One teacher each commented that appreciation from parents and the chance to use creative capabilities was most rewarding to them.

A second open-ended question queried participants about the least satisfying aspect of being an elementary teacher. Of the 140 participating teachers, 125 teachers responded to this question. Again, some teachers responded with multiple answers. After studying the comments, 21 categories emerged.

Table 35 presents a summary of comments concerning the least satisfying aspects of teaching. Poor pay, salary, or compensation was mentioned by 33 teachers and was the most often mentioned aspect. Excessive paperwork concerned 24 teachers. Discipline and dealing with disruptive students that took time away from academics and the students that wanted to learn was mentioned by 20 teachers. Unreasonable parents and lack of parent support was expressed by 19 teachers as the cause of greatest dissatisfaction. Lack of respect from the community (including legislators and school board) was mentioned by 14 teachers.

Lack of time or not enough time to accomplish all their work within the workday evoked comments from 12 teachers. One teacher wrote, "I feel I am a very good teacher and go the extra mile for my students--this requires additional work hours away from school and makes it hard to balance family, husband, and career, although I wouldn't do

Table 35

Responses to Least Satisfying Aspects of Elementary Teaching n = 125

Category	Frequency	Percentage
Pay, salary, compensation	33	26.4
Paperwork	24	19.2
Discipline, dealing with disruptive students	20	16.0
Unreasonable parents, lack of parental support	19	15.2
Lack of respect	14	11.2
Lack of time	12	9.6
Meetings--unnecessary, irrelevant	11	8.8
Work overload	8	6.4
Poor administration/administrators	6	4.8
Lack of autonomy in teaching	6	4.8
Class size	6	4.8
Lack of student achievement	6	4.8
Grades/grading	5	4.0
Referral process for special need students	4	3.2
Bureaucracy	3	2.4
Mandates	3	2.4
Nonteaching duties	3	2.4
Politics	3	2.4
Lack of resources/funding	2	1.6
Lack of advancement opportunities	1	0.8
Dirty school facilities	1	0.8

less than the best for any of them." Closely related comments involving work overload and large class size were made by eight and six teachers respectively. Unnecessary or irrelevant meetings were mentioned by 11 teachers. Poor administration or incompetent administrators were noted by six teachers as least satisfying. Lack of autonomy to make choices concerning curriculum materials and instructional methods and mandates from the state legislature and school board were mentioned by six and three teachers, respectively. Lack of student achievement or the inability to reach or meet student needs was the least

satisfying aspect of teaching for six teachers. Grades or grading students at this early stage of education was problematic to five teachers.

Other categories of comments concerning least satisfying aspects of being an elementary teacher were mentioned by less than five teachers. These categories included referral process for special need students (4), dealing with school bureaucracy (3), nonteaching duties such as bus duty and housecleaning (3), politics (3), lack of resources and funding (2), no chance for advancement (1), and dirty school facilities (1).

Summary

An analysis of the data showed no significant correlation between participation in teacher leadership roles and measures of extrinsic, intrinsic, or general job satisfaction. Multiple regression analyses revealed a significant interaction of school socioeconomic status and student academic achievement with the relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in teacher leadership roles. Significant differences in the amount of teacher leadership were found for years of teaching experience and significant differences in general job satisfaction were found for gender, school size, student achievement, and school socioeconomic status.

Chapter 5 has several purposes. This final chapter further discusses research findings and implications, presents the limitations of the study, and gives suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study was an investigation of elementary teachers' participation in leadership roles, their satisfaction with their job as elementary teachers, and the relationship between participation in leadership roles and job satisfaction. Personal and school site demographic variables were utilized to delineate further the relationships among the variables of the study.

The information for this study was gathered primarily through use of a questionnaire mailed to 270 randomly selected elementary teachers from a single, midsize school district. Of the 270 surveys sent, 140 or 51.9% provided useable data.

This chapter discusses the answers to the six research questions reported in the previous chapters. This chapter also includes a discussion of the study's methodological limitations. A section to discuss the implications of the study and a section to suggest further research conclude the chapter.

Discussion of Research Questions

The demographic profile for the sample used in this study indicated an overwhelming majority of elementary teachers to be Caucasian (92.1%) and female (90.6%). This reflects both the population profile for the district in which the study was conducted (85.7% Caucasian and 90.5% female) and the national trend for ethnicity

(90.7% Caucasian) and gender (90.9% female) among elementary teachers (National Education Association, 1996). The elementary teachers participating in this study indicated a high level of training and education as reflected in the academic degrees attained. In this study, 63.6% of the participants held a master's degree or higher. These data reflect the fact that a major state university is situated in the county in which the study took place. Assuming a teaching career that begins immediately after graduation at approximately 23 years of age, the years of experience reported indicates that some teachers entered the profession at a later age, perhaps as a second career, or took time away from their teaching career perhaps to spend time with family or to pursue further education.

Question 1

Research question 1 sought to determine how actively involved elementary teachers were in teacher leadership roles. The sample mean was slightly more than three leadership roles for the past school year. Cognizant that not all roles require an equal amount of leadership effort, time, and ability, use of a weighted scale provided a way to differentiate the amount of leadership involved in a particular role. A closer look revealed a sample mode or most often occurring number of teacher leadership roles of one. Nineteen teachers in the study did not participate in any teacher leadership roles during the past year. Is this the result of teachers not desiring to participate actively in such roles or is it the result of school principals who fail to offer or encourage leadership opportunities to teachers?

This study did not directly investigate the reasons why teachers choose not to participate in professional leadership roles. Some of the comments to the open-ended questions suggested that two major reasons were work overload and lack of time. Another strand of comments indicated that teachers did not see the participation in leadership roles as within their job descriptions as elementary classroom teachers. Many teachers expressed that the direct, personal, and intimate interaction with the students they taught was their primary and sometimes only focus. This may, in part, reflect the lack of preparation for leadership roles prospective teachers receive in preservice training programs at the university level and a lack of inservice preparation provided by the school district itself.

Question 2

Research question 2 explored how satisfied elementary teachers are with their work. The instrument used in the survey yielded three satisfaction scores--extrinsic, intrinsic, and general. Extrinsic job satisfaction involved participants' feelings about their pay (compensation), advancement opportunities, recognition for the work done, school policies and procedures affecting them as teachers, and quality of supervision both on personal and task dimensions. Intrinsic job satisfaction involved participants' feeling about the work itself involving such factors as variety, ability utilization, responsibility, creativity, independence, social service, achievement, authority, security, morality, activity level, and social status. The general job satisfaction score combined components of extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction with additional components involving feelings about coworkers and working conditions.

A consistent pattern emerged concerning the means of the three satisfaction scores both for the total sample and all demographic groups except for teachers age 60 and over. Intrinsic job satisfaction scores were the highest. Extrinsic job satisfaction scores were the lowest. General job satisfaction scores fell somewhere between intrinsic and extrinsic scores. For teachers age 60 and older, general job satisfaction scores were higher than intrinsic scores, and intrinsic scores were higher than extrinsic scores. This group consisted of only four teachers, and the difference between general and intrinsic satisfaction means was slight.

The job satisfaction survey instrument used a 5-point Likert scale with choices ranging from (5) very satisfied, (4) satisfied, (3) neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, (2) dissatisfied, and (1) very dissatisfied. An overall extrinsic job satisfaction mean of 3.29 places the sample mean between neither satisfied nor dissatisfied and satisfied. An overall intrinsic job satisfaction mean of 4.18 places the sample mean slightly above the satisfied score of 4. An overall general job satisfaction mean of 3.89 places the sample mean slightly below the satisfied score of 4. Does such a general satisfaction score reflect a teaching force sufficiently motivated by the rewards of their work to perform at their maximum or highest potential?

The overwhelming majority of comments concerning the most satisfying aspects of elementary teaching involved intrinsic satisfaction or satisfaction coming from the work itself. Seeing students learn, working with children, and making a difference in the lives of children were the three most frequent comments. Interestingly, very few comments had anything to do with participation in teacher leadership roles. Responses to the least

satisfying aspect of elementary teaching involved more extrinsic satisfaction factors and a lack of some intrinsic satisfaction factors. Poor pay, lack of parental support, and lack of respect from the public were mentioned by more than 1 in 10 teachers. Many comments suggested a feeling of lack of control or power over their circumstances as teachers. Excessive paperwork, disruptive and unruly students, and unreasonable parents were mentioned by more than 10% of teachers. It may be that certain factors, when present, provide a neutral state of feeling but when lacking cause dissatisfaction.

Question 3

Research question 3 sought to determine if there were significant differences in the means of participation in teacher leadership roles when analyzed by personal and school demographics. No significant differences were found for categories or levels of gender, age, academic degree, ethnicity, school size, reading achievement, and school socioeconomic status. A difference was found for years of teaching experience. Those teachers with 16 to 25 years of teaching experience were found to have significantly greater leadership roles than beginning teachers with 1 to 5 years of experience. It is not surprising that this period of 16 to 25 years of experience would be the period when teachers make the greatest contribution to teacher leadership. It is a time when teachers possess the knowledge, expertise, security that comes with years of experience, and perhaps have the least demands from their own family life. After 25 years of service, retirement and the desire for more personal time may become factors for many teachers. Beginning teachers are often consumed with the immediate demands of teaching and

establishing themselves in their own classrooms and learning about the organization and its culture. Thus, beginning teachers are less likely to assume leadership roles.

Question 4

Research question 4 sought to determine if there were significant differences in the means of extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction measures when analyzed by personal and school demographics. Some significant differences were found for each of the three measures.

Gender showed a significant difference for extrinsic, intrinsic, and general job satisfaction. For all three job satisfaction measures, men had significantly less satisfaction than women. The nurturing and caring nature of elementary teaching tends to be culturally and socially viewed as women's work. The typical 9- to 10-month work year may be less appealing to men in terms of time off and resulting compensation loss. Analysis showed that the percentage of males in the population from which the sample was drawn to be 9.5%, while the percentage of male principals in the population's 23 elementary schools to be 39.1%. Such evidence suggests that males are more likely to leave the elementary classroom and move into administrative positions, although not all elementary principals are former elementary classroom teachers. In a national study, Doud and Keller (1998) found a dramatic gender shift in elementary principals over the past decade with women occupying nearly 42% of K-8 principalships--more than doubling since 1988.

The size of the elementary school had a significant effect on the extrinsic and general satisfaction of teachers. Teachers in the largest schools (701-962 students)

experienced the greatest amount of satisfaction. While true in this study, factors other than size may have affected extrinsic and general satisfaction. The largest schools were also those of high socioeconomic status and high academic achievement. Additionally, at some point increasing size may not continue to be associated with greater satisfaction but with increased anonymity and impersonality for teachers and students.

Teachers in schools that scored highest in student academic achievement (i.e., standardized reading test scores) had significantly higher extrinsic job satisfaction than the teachers in middle- and low-achieving schools and significantly higher general job satisfaction that the teachers in low-achieving schools. This may be due to the recognition by the state, by the school board, by the community, by parents, and by principals that schools and teachers receive for high academic achievement of their students.

Teachers in low socioeconomic schools had significantly lower extrinsic job satisfaction than teachers in high socioeconomic schools and had significantly lower general job satisfaction than teachers in schools with middle or high socioeconomic status. These teachers taught in schools with 68.9% to 91% of the students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch. The effort and hard work of teachers of disadvantaged students and the smaller but significant gains of at-risk students are often not recognized or are minimized when compared with other higher achieving schools. These teachers may be working in conditions that include more disrespect, disruption, and violence within the school and community. Lack of parent support and understanding of the importance of education may impact the working conditions of the teacher. Special resources such as

additional student support personnel, additional teaching materials, classroom aides, smaller class size, and health clinic services may improve teacher satisfaction. Teacher turnover and requests for transfer within the school system by teachers in low socioeconomic schools also indicate the dissatisfaction of the teaching staff.

Question 5

Research question 5 sought to determine if there were significant relationships between job satisfaction measures and participation in teacher leadership roles. Furthermore, the question sought to determine if such relationships interacted with demographic variables.

A major finding of this study was that none of the measures of extrinsic, intrinsic, or general job satisfaction were significantly correlated with participation in teacher leadership roles for elementary teachers. Bivariate correlations were found between leadership roles and years of teaching experience, between all measures of job satisfaction and student academic achievement, and between both general and extrinsic job satisfaction and socioeconomic status of a school.

The finding that job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles for elementary teachers are not correlated is contrary to a majority of published literature (Conley & Levinson, 1993; Klecker & Loadman, 1994; Louis & Smith, 1990; Malen, Murphy, & Hart, 1987; Wu & Short, 1996) but not completely unsupported in the literature (Donahoe, 1993; Smylie, Brownlee-Conyers, & Crowson, 1991, Smylie & Denny, 1990). Lack of time, work overload, school infrastructure, school culture, role ambiguity, and insufficient training and support for assumption of leadership roles are

well recognized concerns in the literature. Often, studies take a narrow view of teacher leadership roles such as limiting its definition to participation in decision making or studying a unique school setting that cannot be easily duplicated in public school settings. The hope that participation in teacher leadership roles will attract and retain highly qualified people that would not otherwise stay in teaching is far from conclusive. The needs of the individual teacher will determine the amount of satisfaction gained from teacher leadership roles (Bilken, 1986; Ellis, 1988; Frase & Sorenson, 1992; Lortie, 1975; McLaughlin & Yee, 1988). It is likely that those teachers who find leadership roles most rewarding and satisfying will consider moving into principalships or other administrative positions.

Multiple regression analyses were used to determine if the relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles interacted with the demographic variables of the study. Student reading achievement and school socioeconomic status both had significant interactions with the relationship between general job satisfaction and participation in leadership roles. As the reading achievement and socioeconomic status of a school increases, the correlation between participation in leadership roles and general job satisfaction for teachers decreases. The decreases in correlation between job satisfaction and leadership roles as reading achievement and socioeconomic status increase indicates that at higher reading achievement and socioeconomic levels, higher scores for participation in leadership roles are associated with lower job satisfaction scores.

Question 6

An artificial dichotomy for level of participation in teacher leadership roles was created to test if there were significant differences in the means of job satisfaction measures. No significant differences were found in extrinsic, intrinsic, or general job satisfaction for teachers with high, medium, or low levels of participation in leadership roles. Extending opportunities for teacher leadership to elementary teachers with the intent to attract and retain teachers may not be successful. Such opportunities do not appear to be significantly rewarding or satisfying to a large enough segment of elementary teachers.

Discussion of Limitations

A methodological limitation of the study involved the use of a self-report measure. A survey using a questionnaire may have a self-report bias. Respondents may not be completely honest with their answers. Some teachers may have a sense of shame or failure associated with a response of less than satisfied with their profession, or others may have a need to exaggerate their leadership roles as teachers. Questionnaires cannot probe deeply into respondents' feelings or opinions, nor can items be clarified if respondents are in doubt of their meaning.

Although participants were assured in the cover letter that data would be protected and reported only as aggregated group data, there was not complete anonymity. A code number was used to permit follow up with nonrespondents to assure a sufficient

number of responses. This may have resulted in less than candid answers or a failure to respond.

The instruments themselves may have limitations. The researcher attempted to create a valid and reliable survey instrument to assess participation in teacher leadership roles. A review of literature on leadership roles, a thorough study of the specific opportunities for teacher leadership in the school district, and the input from a panel of five experienced and currently serving principals from the school district were used in the development of a checklist instrument. The five principals rated the amount of leadership ranging from 0 to 3 needed for each role. In retrospect, a rating ranging from 0 to 10 may have created a more meaningful effect size. The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire is a standardized test for measuring job satisfaction with established validity and reliability. However, one item concerning the ability to keep busy on the job was noted by several respondents as being unclear as to its meaning. They considered themselves too busy and not lacking for things to do as the question seemed to imply.

The teacher sample was randomly drawn from the population of a single, medium-sized school district serving a diverse population of students. The results of this study may not be generalized beyond the population of this study.

Discussion of Implications

1. Participation in teacher leadership roles does not appear to be a significant incentive to attract and retain people in elementary teaching. Better pay, better teaching conditions (smaller class size, more student support personnel, sufficient and appropriate

materials and facilities), and more respect for the profession from the public are what teachers in this study indicated to be essential factors in creating and maintaining a satisfied and well-qualified teaching force.

2. Many talented and successful teachers do not desire leadership roles, but are motivated and sufficiently satisfied by mastery of their discipline and their daily interaction with students within their individual classroom. Satisfaction and reward in the teaching profession is very individualistic in nature. However, opportunities for participation in leadership should be available to all teachers and not restricted or reserved for a few. The idea that opportunities are in themselves satisfying has empirical support. Miller and Monge (1986) found that working in a participative climate had more positive effect on worker satisfaction than did actual participation in specific decision making. Notwithstanding, no teacher should be required to assume such roles.

3. Participation in teacher leadership roles may require release time from regular teaching duties to prevent a negative effect on teaching preparedness or teacher dissatisfaction from overwork. Many teacher comments reflected feelings of work overload and simply not enough time in the day to get everything done. However, Devaney (1987) and Walters and Guthro (1992) warned that a teacher loses credibility as a teacher leader if not actively engaged in some classroom teaching.

4. Preservice college coursework and experiences as well as inservice and support for teachers in the workforce are needed to give teachers the necessary skills to be successful in teacher leadership roles. Role ambiguity (Glisson & Durick, 1988) and

ability to do a job (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992) are two variables that have been shown to be correlated with job satisfaction.

Suggestions for Further Research

1. Further research might replicate this study for middle school and high school teachers to explore whether there exists a significant relationship between participation in teacher leadership roles and job satisfaction at these levels.

2. Salaries for Florida's public school teachers rank near the bottom of the 50 states. Salaries in this particular school district are in the bottom third for the state. Further research might replicate this study in a school district that has a high per pupil expenditure and pays salaries at the top of the national salary rankings to see if a significant relationship exists between job satisfaction and teacher leadership.

3. Charter schools are increasing in number throughout Florida. Further research might replicate this study for teachers in charter schools where presumably teachers would have more leadership possibilities.

4. If a relationship between participation in teacher leadership roles and job satisfaction is found in any of the above studies, further research needs to investigate whether the institutions representing the population are better able to attract and retain highly qualified teachers and whether the relationship impacts student achievement.

5. A study might be conducted to investigate the expectations held by graduating or graduate elementary teacher candidates concerning their roles as teacher leaders. Such a study might reveal discrepancies between teacher expectations and employer needs and

may be used to revamp preservice, induction, and inservice programs to better prepare teachers as leaders.

6. In this study the size of the elementary school had a significant effect on the job satisfaction of teachers. Teachers in the largest schools (701-962 students) had the greatest amount of extrinsic and general job satisfaction. A study might be conducted in schools with student populations of over 1,000 to investigate whether teacher satisfaction continues to increase or at some point decreases and whether job satisfaction and teacher leadership is significantly related in these schools.

APPENDIX A
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

April 16, 1998

Dear Teacher:

My name is Patty Grill. I am a second grade teacher at J. J. Finley and a doctoral student at the University of Florida under the supervision of Dr. James Doud.

For my dissertation, I am researching the relationship between teacher leadership opportunities and satisfaction with the job of elementary teaching. Will you please take 5-10 minutes to complete the enclosed survey? Your participation is voluntary. You do not have to answer any question you do not wish to answer. There are no risks or immediate benefits to you. Please return the survey in the self addressed stamped envelope to me by May 8, 1998.

Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law and in no way be connected with the information you give. I am not concerned with individual responses, but with an aggregate of data collected from teachers throughout the county. The code number in the upper corner will be used only to follow up with nonrespondents. This list will be destroyed once data collection is completed.

If you have questions about this study, please contact me at --- ---- or Dr. Doud at 392-2391. Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to the UF Institutional Review Board Office, University of Florida, Box 112250, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; phone 392-0433.

I appreciate you taking time from your busy schedule to complete this survey. Your input is very important to my study. Again, thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Patty Grill

Approved by the University of Florida Institutional Review Board for use through MAR 19 1999

SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS' ROLES

Directions: Put a check (✓) in front of all statements that apply to you during the past year.

_____ Grade level team leader, department head, or Title I lead teacher

_____ Mentor (PEER) teacher to a beginning (first year) teacher

_____ Supervising teacher for full-time university student intern

_____ Officer or committee chair in an educational organization, (i.e., Reading Council, Phi Delta Kappa, Delta Kappa Gamma, TAWL, etc.)

_____ School Advisory Council (SAC) teacher representative

_____ Building representative for ACEA or member of union bargaining team

_____ Inservice presenter for other teachers

_____ Workshop presenter for a parent or community group

_____ Student in a graduate level course at a university or college

_____ Presenter at a seminar or conference on an education topic

_____ Developer of curriculum ideas and materials that have been adapted and used by other teachers

_____ Grant writer (Title II, Chamber of Commerce, etc.) for a project that has been given funding

_____ Action researcher in a study concerning classroom practice

_____ Author of a published article concerning education

_____ Active participant in decision making with schoolwide implications (i.e., budgeting, scheduling, personnel, curriculum, etc.)

_____ Lead teacher during extended school year

_____ Teacher representative on a district committee (i.e., CREATE, textbook selection, policy revision, etc.)

_____ Participant in a pilot study

Directions: Please provide the following demographic information by checking (✓) the appropriate response.

1. Gender:

_____Male

_____Female

2. Age:

_____20-29

_____30-39

_____40-49

_____50-59

_____60 and over

3. Years of Teaching Experience:

_____1-5 years

_____6-10 years

_____11-15 years

_____16-20 years

_____21-25 years

_____26 years and over

4. Highest Educational Degree:

_____Bachelor's Degree

_____Master's Degree

_____Specialist Degree

_____Doctoral Degree

5. Ethnic Group:

_____White/Caucasian

_____Black/Afro-American

_____Hispanic

_____Other

6. Probable job status in 5 years:

_____elementary teacher

_____administrator

_____retired

_____unemployed

_____another profession

What is the most rewarding (satisfying) aspect of being an elementary teacher?

What is the least rewarding (satisfying) aspect of being an elementary teacher?

APPENDIX B
PRINCIPALS' WEIGHTED RATINGS

February 5, 1998

Dear (Principal's name):

I am a teacher at Finley Elementary. I am also a doctoral student in educational leadership at the University of Florida working on my dissertation.

Would you take a few minutes to participate in a pilot study of the enclosed researcher developed survey instrument? In doing so, you would help establish the content validity of the instrument.

Please read each statement and rate it according to the amount of teacher leadership you would expect to be demonstrated in fulfilling each role. Use the following rating scale:

0 = no teacher leadership demonstrated
1 = minimal amount of teacher leadership demonstrated
2 = moderate amount of teacher leadership demonstrated
3 = maximum amount of teacher leadership demonstrated.

If you feel the item is unclear or could be better stated, please make a note on the "Comments" page. If you can suggest any other teacher leadership roles fulfilled by classroom teachers that are not listed, please add this to the "Comments" page also.

Your participation is greatly appreciated by me. Please return to me as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope. Thank you again for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Patty Grill

attachment: Comments

SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY TEACHERS' ROLES (Weighted)

Directions: Put a check (✓) in front of all statements that apply to you during the past year.

3.0 Grade level team leader, department head, or Title I lead teacher

2.8 Mentor (PEER) teacher to a beginning (first year) teacher

3.0 Supervising teacher for full-time university student intern

2.8 Officer or committee chair in an educational organization, (i.e., Reading Council, Phi Delta Kappa, Delta Kappa Gamma, TAWL, etc.)

2.4 School Advisory Council (SAC) teacher representative

2.2 Building representative for ACEA or member of union bargaining team

3.0 Inservice presenter for other teachers

2.8 Workshop presenter for a parent or community group

1.8 Student in a graduate level course at a university or college

3.0 Presenter at a seminar or conference on an education topic

2.8 Developer of curriculum ideas and materials that have been adapted and used by other teachers

2.6 Grant writer (Title II, Chamber of Commerce, etc.) for a project that has been given funding

2.2 Action researcher in a study concerning classroom practice

2.4 Author of a published article concerning education

2.8 Active participant in decision making with schoolwide implications (i.e., budgeting, scheduling, personnel, curriculum, etc.)

3.0 Lead teacher during extended school year

2.4 Teacher representative on a district committee (i.e., CREATE, textbook selection, policy revision, etc.)

1.4 Participant in a pilot study

Total possible weighted value = 46.4

APPENDIX C
FLORIDA SCHOOL INDICATORS REPORT

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Florida School Indicators Report

Elementary Schools

ALACHUA	Number of Students	Free/ Reduced-Price Lunch (%)	Students with Disabilities (%)	Gifted (%)	Limited English Proficient (%)	Mobility (%)
	14183	56	16.2	9.9	1.5	29.5
ALACHUA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	547	52.8	17.4	4.8	1.1	17.6
ARCHER COMMUNITY SCHOOL	535	69.9	22.2	4.5	1.7	31.7
C W. NORTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	707	27	11.7	11	0.4	19.4
CHARLES W. DUVAL ELEMENTARY	435	91	20.6	1.8	0	46.9
CHESTER SHELL ELEMENTARY SCH	391	76	18.1	2.3	0	30.7
GLEN SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	600	50.7	14.4	13.2	0.4	24.1
HIDDEN OAK ELEMENTARY	806	36.8	14.4	12.9	0.4	22
HIGH SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	613	41.1	13.4	6.4	0	20
IDYLWILD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	795	68.9	18.2	7.8	0.9	50.8
J. J. FINLEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	540	38.9	11.5	29.6	11	28
JOSEPH WILLIAMS ELEMENTARY SCH	549	83.6	14	4.2	9.8	42.7
KIMBALL WILES ELEM SCHOOL	962	37.4	12.4	17.7	0	25.4
LAKE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	607	84.8	29.2	4.1	0	28.5
LITTLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	701	41.8	18.4	21	0.5	24.3
MARJORIE K. RAWLINGS ELEM SCH	662	79.6	13	3.8	1.3	30.2
MYRA TERWILLIGER ELEMENTARY	690	42.5	12.3	12.5	1.8	31.8
NEWBERRY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	509	61.5	18.7	5.7	0.2	25.4
PRAIRIE VIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	606	77.6	11.4	7.9	1.8	38.6
STEPHEN FOSTER ELEMENTARY SCH	461	76.6	26	9.5	0.3	50.2
W. A. METCALFE ELEMENTARY SCH	685	70.4	23.7	6.6	0.7	28.6
W.W. IRBY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL	688	56.8	15.8	1	1.1	24.1
WALDO COMMUNITY SCHOOL	257	71.2	14.4	3.5	0	32.1
WILLIAM S. TALBOT ELEM SCHOOL	837	17.7	10.2	18.5	1.5	18.6
STATE 1996-1997	1127315	52.4	14.4	3.8	7.7	33.3

APPENDIX D
ITBS READING SCORES

IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS
GRADE 2

	READING						MATH					
	Median			Mean			Median			Mean		
SCHOOL	'96	'97	'98	'96	'97	'98	'96	'97	'98	'96	'97	'98
ALACHUA	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
ARCHER	40	49	49	44	50	49	45	53	48	45	53	53
DUVAL	17	30	32	19	32	34	19	30	50	21	30	50
FINLEY	68	69	72	67	69	70	79	67	76	71	69	74
FOSTER	55	72	60	53	67	63	53	79	62	55	76	69
GLEN SPRINGS	69	59	57	70	57	57	78	66	58	76	62	65
HIDDEN OAK	69	53	63	69	57	67	76	66	80	80	62	80
HIGH SPRINGS	50	49	55	49	53	59	53	48	57	53	50	58
IDYLWILD	35	40	40	40	46	44	59	50	47	50	53	48
IRBY	55	53	53	55	55	59	55	55	65	50	55	62
LAKE FOREST	28	40	23	34	44	30	36	45	28	38	48	33
LITTLEWOOD	75	57	60	69	59	67	78	69	74	78	67	71
METCALFE	42	44	32	46	46	38	33	50	24	38	48	28
NEWBERRY	63	53	46	67	61	59	66	74	65	42	69	67
NORTON	74	75	67	72	74	67	65	71	71	67	69	67
PRAIRIE VIEW	59	40	36	55	42	44	62	62	67	59	59	69
RAWLINGS	28	32	36	32	34	36	42	30	30	65	33	28
SHELL	32	45	25	40	49	34	40	67	36	48	67	42
TALBOT	72	75	77	74	80	78	80	84	86	45	82	85
TERWILLIGER	60	57	61	63	61	59	78	67	57	78	69	62
WALDO	44	49	53	44	55	50	67	65	71	76	71	71
WILES	63	67	72	63	67	70	69	69	79	67	69	76
WILLIAMS	39	36	24	44	42	32	48	46	28	69	53	30
DISTRICT	53	53	49	57	55	55	59	59	58	53	59	59

APPENDIX E
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Institutional Review Board

98A Psychology Bldg.
PO Box 112250
Gainesville, FL 32611-2250
(352) 392-0433
Fax (352) 392-0433

DATE: 09-Apr-98

TO: Ms. Patricia A. Grill
1835 NW 20th Way
Gainesville, FL 32605

FROM: C. Michael Levy, Chair
University of Florida
Institutional Review Board

SUBJECT: **Approval of Project #** 1998 - 209

TITLE: The Relationship between Leadership Roles and Job Satisfaction among Elementary Teachers (Doctoral Dissertation)

FUNDING: Unfunded

I am pleased to advise you that the University of Florida Institutional Review Board has recommended approval of this project. Based on its review of your protocol, the UFIRB determined that this research presents no more than minimal risk to participants, and based of 45 CFR 46.117(c), authorizes you to administer the informed consent process as specified in the attached description.

If you wish to make any changes to this protocol, you must disclose your plans before you implement them so that the Board can assess their impact on your project. In addition, you must report to the Board any unexpected complications arising from the project that affect your participants.

If you have not completed this project by 19-Mar-99, please telephone our office (392-0433) and we will tell you how to obtain a renewal.

It is important that you keep your Department Chair informed about the status of this research project.

CML/h2

Cc: Vice President for Research
Dr. J. Doud

APPENDIX F
STATISTICAL ANALYSES

TABLE 1: OVERALL

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	N
LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.5743	6.6322	140
EXT. JOB SAT.	3.2918	0.8000	140
INT. JOB SAT.	4.1840	0.4576	140
GEN. JOB SAT.	3.8909	0.5031	140

TABLE 2: GENDER

GENDER	Variable	Mean	Std Dev	N
Male	LEADERSHIP ROLE	6.5385	6.4241	13
	EXT. JOB SAT.	2.8646	0.8358	13
	INT. JOB SAT.	3.8462	0.6095	13
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.5400	0.6240	13
Female	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.8063	6.6636	126
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.3316	0.7885	126
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2190	0.4291	126
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.9263	0.4795	126

TABLE 3: AGE

AGE	Variable	Mean	Std Dev	N
20-29	LEADERSHIP ROLE	6.4400	6.2375	25
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.2672	0.7449	25
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2068	0.5168	25
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.8900	0.5426	25
30-39	LEADERSHIP ROLE	9.1833	7.9922	24
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.0317	0.9021	24
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.0804	0.4892	24
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.7425	0.5792	24
40-49	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.6383	6.4100	47
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.3136	0.6905	47
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.1962	0.4168	47
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.9057	0.4298	47
50-59	LEADERSHIP ROLE	9.4256	6.3515	39
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.3677	0.8590	39
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2113	0.4449	39
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.9321	0.5109	39
60+	LEADERSHIP ROLE	10.6500	5.3650	4
	EXT. JOB SAT.	4.2500	0.3949	4
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2575	0.6723	4
	GEN. JOB SAT.	4.3100	0.4192	4

TABLE 4: YEARS TEACHING

YEARS TEACHING	Variable	Mean	Std Dev	N
1-5	LEADERSHIP ROLE	5.2364	5.5945	33
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.2533	0.8118	33
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.1615	0.4904	33
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.8500	0.5490	33
6-10	LEADERSHIP ROLE	7.9727	7.7374	22
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.0150	0.6190	22
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.0877	0.3933	22
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.7318	0.3945	22
11-15	LEADERSHIP ROLE	10.2250	8.9520	16
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.4319	0.8428	16
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.1725	0.5664	16
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.9638	0.5951	16
16-20	LEADERSHIP ROLE	11.3222	5.7153	18
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.3994	0.6164	18
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.3256	0.3016	18
	GEN. JOB SAT.	4.0222	0.3186	18
21-25	LEADERSHIP ROLE	10.9538	6.2820	26
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.3681	0.8104	26
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2065	0.4672	26
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.9335	0.5073	26
26+	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.0000	4.0862	25
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.3396	0.9964	25
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.1804	0.4895	25
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.8996	0.5680	25

TABLE 5: EDUCATION LEVEL

ED. LEVEL	Variable	Mean	Std Dev	N
Bachelors	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.3373	7.3235	51
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.2631	0.7753	51
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.1439	0.4855	51
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.8598	0.5296	51
Masters	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.7101	6.2412	89
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.3082	0.8177	89
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2070	0.4420	89
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.9088	0.4895	89

TABLE 6: ETHNICITY

ETHNICITY	Variable	Mean	Std Dev	N
White	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.6562	6.7943	128
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.2769	0.8170	128
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.1805	0.4535	128
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.8852	0.5036	128
Other	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.4000	4.2048	11
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.4918	0.6026	11
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2864	0.4903	11
	GEN. JOB SAT.	4.0064	0.5030	11

TABLE 7: SCHOOL SIZE

SCHOOL SIZE	Variable	Mean	Std Dev	N
Small	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.9963	6.6558	54
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.3978	0.6544	54
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.1831	0.3878	54
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.9178	0.4003	54
Medium	LEADERSHIP ROLE	7.1822	6.0824	45
	EXT. JOB SAT.	2.9631	0.8135	45
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.0911	0.4447	45
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.7151	0.5022	45
Large	LEADERSHIP ROLE	9.5463	7.0760	41
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.5129	0.8612	41
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2871	0.5388	41
	GEN. JOB SAT.	4.0485	0.5734	41

TABLE 8: READING ACHIEVEMENT

READING	Variable	Mean	Std Dev	N
Low	LEADERSHIP ROLE	7.3581	7.0078	43
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.0330	0.7914	43
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.0558	0.4341	43
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.6963	0.4728	43
Middle	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.5333	5.9949	42
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.1171	0.7564	42
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2157	0.4243	42
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.8560	0.4706	42
High	LEADERSHIP ROLE	9.5564	6.7512	55
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.6275	0.7308	55
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2600	0.4858	55
	GEN. JOB SAT.	4.0698	0.4958	55

TABLE 9: FREE/REDUCED LUNCH

LUNCH	Variable	Mean	Std Dev	N
Low	LEADERSHIP ROLE	9.4240	6.8781	25
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.5408	0.9083	25
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2112	0.6227	25
	GEN. JOB SAT.	4.0176	0.6377	25
Middle	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.5188	5.8356	64
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.3736	0.7433	64
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.2369	0.3797	64
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.9609	0.4474	64
High	LEADERSHIP ROLE	8.2275	7.4952	51
	EXT. JOB SAT.	3.0671	0.7720	51
	INT. JOB SAT.	4.1043	0.4517	51
	GEN. JOB SAT.	3.7410	0.4681	51

REFERENCES

Alexander, L. (1991). America 2000: An education strategy. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Barth, R. S. (1988a). Principals, teachers, and school leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 639-642.

Barth, R. S. (1988b). School: A community of leaders. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp. 129-147). New York: Teachers College Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). Bass and Stodgill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications (3rd ed.). New York: Free Press.

Bennis, W. B., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.

Bilken, S. K. (1986). I have always worked: Elementary schoolteaching as a career. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 504-512.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1996). The fire is back: Principals sharing school governance. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Boles, K., & Troen, V. (1994, April). Teacher leadership in a professional development school. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Bolton, B. (1984). Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. In D. J. Keyser & R. C. Sweetland (Eds.), Test critiques (Vol. V, pp. 255-265). Kansas City, MO: Test Corporation of America.

Boyer, E. L. (1985). In the aftermath of excellence. Educational Leadership, 46 (6), 10-13.

Brass D. J. (1981). Structural relationships, job characteristics, and worker satisfaction and performance. Administrative Science Quarterly, 26, 331-348.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

Campbell, R. E., Cunningham, L. L., Nystrand, R. O., & Usdan, M. D. (1990). The organization and control of American schools. Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Washington, DC: Author.

Christensen, J. C., McDonnell, J. H., & Price, J. R. (1988). Personalizing staff development: The career lattice model. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Cohen, M. (1990). Key issues confronting state policy makers. In F. F. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 251-288). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Conley, S., & Levinson. R. (1993). Teacher work redesign and job satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29, 453-478.

Conway, J. A. (1990). Organizational rites as culture markers of schools. Urban Education, 25, 195-206.

Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone E. F. (1992). Job satisfaction. New York: Lexington.

Csikzentmihalyi, M., & McCormack, J. (1986). The influence of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 415-419.

Darling-Hammond, L., Bullmaster, M.L., & Cobb, V. L. (1995). Rethinking teacher leadership through professional development schools. The Elementary School Journal, 96, 87-106.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate cultures: Rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Devaney, K. (1987). The lead teacher: Ways to begin. New York: Carnegie Forum on Education and Economy.

Donahoe, T. (1993). Finding the way: Structure, time, and culture in school improvement. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 295-305.

Doud, J. L., & Keller, E. P. (1998). The K-8 Principal in 1998. Principal, 78, 5-12.

Duke, D. L., Showers, B. K., & Imber, M. (1990). Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16, 93-106.

Dunst, R. (1991, February). Issues in empowerment. Presentation before the annual meeting of Childrens' Mental Health and Service Policy Convention, Tampa, FL.

Ellis, N. H. (1988, April). Job redesign: Can it influence teacher motivation? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the New England Educational Research Organization, Rockport, ME.

Fay, D. (1992). Empowering through leadership: In the teacher's voice. In C. Livingston (Ed.), Teachers as leaders: Evolving roles (pp. 57-90). Washington DC: National Education Association.

Finn, C. E. (1991). We must take charge. New York: The Free Press.

Firestone, W. A. (1989). Using reform: Conceptualizing district initiative. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 11, 151-165.

Fleishman, E. A., & Harris, E. F. (1982). Patterns of leadership behavior related to employee grievances and turnover. Personal Psychology, 15, 43-56.

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and promises. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Frase, L. E., & Sorenson, L. (1992). Teacher motivation and satisfaction: Impact on participatory management. NAASP Bulletin, 76 (3), 37-43.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces. New York: The Falmer Press.

Fullan, M., & Stiegelbauer, S. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gerhart, B. (1987). How important are dispositional factors as determinants of job satisfaction: Implications for job design and other personnel programs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 366-373.

Getzels, J. W., & Guba, E. G. (1957). Social behavior and the administrative process. The School Review, 65, 423-441.

Gladstein, D. (1984). Groups in context: A model of task group effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 29, 499-517.

Glick, W. H., Jenkens, G. D., & Gupta, N. (1986). Method versus substance: How strong are underlying relationships between job characteristics and attitudinal outcomes. Academy of Management Journal, 29, 441-464.

Glickman, C. (1985). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in human service organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 33, 61-81.

Goodlad, J. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw Hill.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Griffin, G. (1991). Toward a community of learners: The preparation and continuing education of teachers. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Griffin, G. A. (1995). Influences of shared decision making on school on classroom activity. The Elementary School Journal, 96, 29-46.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 16, 250-279.

Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1980). Work redesign. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Halpin, A. W. (1966). Theory and research in administration. New York: Macmillian.

Hargreaves, A. (1994). Changing teachers, changing times. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hart, A. W. (1995). Reconceiving school leadership: Emergent views. The Elementary School Journal, 96, 9-28.

Hart, A. W., & Bredeson, P. V. (1996). The principalship: Toward professional learning and practice. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Heller, M. F., & Firestone, W. A. (1995). Who's in charge here? Sources of leadership for change in eight schools. The Elementary School Journal, 96, 65-86.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World Publishing.

Herzberg, F. (1976). The managerial choice: To be efficient and to be human. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

The Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrow's school: Principles for the design of professional development schools. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. E. (1996). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Immegart, G. L. (1988). Leadership and leader behavior. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.). Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 259-277). New York: Longman.

Jago, A. G. (1982). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. Management Science, 28, 315-336.

Johnson, M. (1993). Emergent patterns of leadership in a shared decision-making school (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 55-10A, 3079.

Jones, J. E. (1981). The organizational universe. In J. E. Jones & J. W. Pfeiffer (Eds.), The annual handbook for group facilitators (pp. 129-137). San Diego, CA: University Associates.

Kaiser, J. S. (1985). The principalship. Minneapolis, MN: Burgess Publishing.

Kanter, R. M. (1983). The change masters. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Katz, R. (1978). Job longevity as a situational factor in job satisfaction. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23, 204-223.

Kerchner, C. T., & Caufman, K. D. (1995). Lurching toward professionalism: The saga of teacher unionism. The Elementary School Journal, 96, 107-122.

Kim, I., & Loadman, W. E. (1994). Predicting teacher job satisfaction. Columbus: The Ohio State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 383 707)

Klecker, B., & Loadman, W. E. (1996, October). Exploring the relationship between teacher empowerment and teacher job satisfaction. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-Western Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Kowalski, T. J., & Reitzug, U. C. (1993). Contemporary school administration. New York: Longman.

Leiberman, M. (1986). Beyond public education. New York: Praeger.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1986). On goodness of schools: Themes of empowerment. Peabody Journal of Education, 63(3), 9-28.

Lieberman, A. (1992). Teacher leadership: What are we learning? In C. Livingston (Ed.), Teachers as leaders: Evolving roles (pp. 159-165). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1990). Restructuring schools: What matters and what works. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 759-764.

Little, J. W. (1988). Assessing the prospects for teacher leadership. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp. 78-108). New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. W. (1995). Contested ground: The basis of teacher leadership in two restructured high schools. The Elementary School Journal, 96, 47-63.

Livingston, C. (Ed.). (1992). Teachers as leaders: Evolving roles. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lopez, E. M. (1982). A test of the self-consistency theory of the job performance--Job satisfaction relationship. Academy of Management Journal, 25, 335-348.

Lortie, D. C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Louis, D. S., & Smith, B. (1990). Teacher working conditions. In P. Reyes (Ed.). Teachers and their workplace: Commitment, performance, and productivity (pp. 23-27). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). A blueprint for empowering teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 472-477.

Malen, B., Murphy, M. J., & Hart, A. W. (1987). Restructuring teacher compensation systems: An analysis of three incentive strategies. In K. Alexander & D. H. Monk (Eds.), Attracting and compensating teachers (pp. 91-142). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Marshall, S. (1993). Managing the culture: The key to effective change. School Organisation, 13, 255-267.

Martin, J. K., & Shehan, C. L. (1989). Education and job satisfaction: The influence of gender, wage-earning status, and job values. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 16, 184 -199.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). Motivation and personality (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Pfeiffer, R. S. (1988). Teacher evaluation: Improvement, accountability, and effective learning. New York: Teacher College Press.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Yee, S. M. (1988). School as a place to have a career. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools (pp. 23-44). New York: Teachers College Press.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1983). The structure of educational organizations. In J. B. Meyer, & W. R. Scott (Eds.), Organizational environments. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, K. I., & Monge, P. R. (1986). Participation, satisfaction, and productivity: A meta-analytic review. Academy of Management Journal, 29, 727-753.

Miller, L. (1992). Teacher Leadership in a renewing school. In C. Livingston (Ed.), Teachers as leaders: Evolving roles (pp. 115-129). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Miskel, C., & Ogawa, R. (1988). Work motivation, job satisfaction, and climate. In N. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook on research on educational administration (pp. 279-304). New York: Longman.

Moore, D. S. (1995). The basic practice of statistics. New York: Freeman and Company.

Morgan G. (1986). Images of organization. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

National Commission of Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for school reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education.

National Education Association. (1996). Status of the American public school teacher 1995-96. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Newman, J. W. (1990). America's teachers. New York: Longman.

Owens, R. G. (1991). Organizational behavior in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Peterson, K. D. (1988). Mechanisms of culture building and principals' work. Education and Urban Society, 20. 250-261.

Porter, L. W. (1961). A study of perceived need satisfaction in bottom and middle-management jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 45 (1), 1-10.

Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). Managerial attitudes and performance. Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Powell, W. W., & DiMaggio, P. J. (1991). The new institutionalism in organization analysis. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1985). School reform: The district policy implementations of the effective school literature. The Elementary School Journal, 85, 353-389.

Quarstein, V. A., McAfee, R. B., & Glassman, M. (1992). The situational occurrences theory of job satisfaction. Human Relations, 45, 859-873.

Reichers, A.E., & Schneider, B. (1990). Climate and culture: An evolution of constructs. In B. Schneider (Ed.), Organizational climate and culture (pp. 5-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rizzo, J. R., House, R. J., & Lirtzman, S. L. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15, 150-163.

Rosenholtz, S. (1985). Political myths about education reform: Lessons from research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 349-355.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Teachers' workplace: The social organization of schools. New York: Longman.

Rosenholtz, S. J., & Simpson, C. (1990). Workplace conditions and the rise and fall of teachers' commitment. Sociology of Education, 63, 241-257.

Schein, E. H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schmidt, G. L. (1976). Job satisfaction among secondary school administrators. Educational Administration Quarterly, 12, 81-95.

Schriesheim, C. S., House, R. J., & Kerr, S. (1976). Leadership initiating structure: A reconciliation of discrepant research results. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 15, 197-321.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Currency Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1987). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Why we should seek substitutes for leadership. Educational Leadership, 49(5), 41-45.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). Building community in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Carver, F. D. (1973). The new school executive: A theory of administration. New York: Dodd, Mead, & Company.

Shavelson, R. J. (1996). Statistical reasoning for the behavioral sciences (3rd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Short, P. M., & Rinehart, J. S. (1992). School participant empowerment scale: Assessment of level of empowerment with in the school environment. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52, 951-960.

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Smylie, M. A. (1992). Teacher participation in school decision making. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14, 53-68.

Smylie, M. A. (1995). New perspectives on teacher leadership. The Elementary School Journal, 96, 3-7.

Smylie, M. A., Brownlee-Conyers, J., & Crowson, R. (1991). When teachers make district level decisions. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Smylie, M. A., & Denny, J. W. (1990). Teacher leadership: Tensions and ambiguities in organizational perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26, 235-255.

Smyth, J. (1989). A pedagogical and educative view on leadership. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 179-204). London: Falmer Press.

Snyder, K. J. (1988). Managing a productive school work culture. NAASP Bulletin, 48(3), 40-43.

Suleiman, M. F., & Moore, R. (1996, June). Teachers' roles revisited: Beyond classroom management. Paper presented at the Summer Workshop of the Association of Teacher Educators, Tarpon Springs, FL.

Thompson, D. P., McNamara, J. F., & Hoyle, J. R. (1997). Job satisfaction in educational organizations: A synthesis of research findings. Educational Administration Quarterly, 33, 7-37.

Tuckman, B. W. (1994). Conducting educational research. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace & Co.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley & Sons.

Walters, S., & Guthro, C. (1992). Leading, learning, and leaving. In C. Livingston (Ed.), Teachers as leaders: Evolving roles (pp. 131-155). Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Wasley, P. A. (1992). Working together: Teacher leadership and collaboration. In C. Livingston (Ed.), Teachers as leaders: Evolving roles (pp. 21-55). Washinton, DC: National Education Association.

Weick, K. E. (1982). Administering education in loosely coupled schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 673-676.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., & Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Wu, V., & Short, P. M. (1996). The relationship of empowerment to teacher job commitment and job satisfaction. Journal of Instructional Psychology, 23 (1), 85-89.

Yukl, G. (1994). Leadership in organizations (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Zimmerman, M. A.,& Rappaport, J. (1988). Citizen participation, perceived control, and psychological empowerment. American Journal of Community Psychology, 16, 725-750.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Patricia Grill graduated from Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio, with a bachelor's degree in elementary education. She taught in elementary schools in Ohio before moving to Gainesville in 1978. Mrs. Grill first entered the University of Florida as a law student in 1980. She subsequently returned to teaching and received a master's degree in 1986 and a specialist degree in 1993 in educational leadership from the University of Florida. She has taught in public elementary schools for 21 years. During that time, she has been active in many teacher leadership roles. She is married to Leonard J. Grill, and they have two sons.

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

James L. Doud, Chair
Professor of Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

M. David Miller
Professor of Foundations of Education

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Paul S. George
Professor of Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

R. Craig Wood
Professor of Educational Leadership

I certify that I have read this study and that in my opinion it conforms to acceptable standards of scholarly presentation and is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Education.

Elizabeth Bondy

Elizabeth Bondy
Associate Professor of Instruction and Curriculum

This dissertation was submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the College of Education and to the Graduate School and was accepted as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

December 1998

Roderick J. McDavis

Dean, College of Education

Dean, Graduate School